A
0000382788
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
fornia
nal
y

Raffaello dip. *Lodovico Vendramini dis. ed inc.*

PAX VOBIS.

Il quadro originale esiste in Brescia presso il Nob.^le Sig.^r Conte Paolo Tosi.

THE WORKS

OF

THE MOST REVEREND

WILLIAM MAGEE, D.D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN:

NOW FIRST COLLECTED AND PRINTED FROM THE AUTHOR'S CORRECTED COPIES:

COMPRISING,

DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES

OF

ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE;

HIS PUBLISHED SERMONS, AND VISITATION CHARGES.

WITH

A MEMOIR OF HIS LIFE,

BY

THE REV. A. H. KENNEY, D.D.,

RECTOR OF SAINT OLAVE'S, SOUTHWARK; FORMERLY DEAN OF ACHONRY; AND FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

T. CADELL, STRAND.

W. BLACKWOOD AND SONS, EDINBURGH;
AND A. MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

MDCCCXLII.

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Page

I. ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXPLANATORY DISSERTATIONS ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES OF ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE, concluded :—

No. LXX.—On the CORRESPONDENCE between the *Annual Expiation under the Law*, and the *One Great Expiation under the Gospel* 1

No. LXXI.—On the nature and import of the ceremony of the SCAPE GOAT 2

No. LXXII.—Socinian objections urged by a Divine of the Established Church, against the doctrine of the *vicarious import* of the Mosaic sacrifices, and against other doctrines of the Church of England 4

No. LXXIII.—The Atonement by the *sacrifice of Christ more strictly vicarious, than that by the Mosaic sacrifices* whereby it was typified 24

No. LXXIV.—CONCLUDING NUMBER 25

II. APPENDIX, containing an account of the UNITARIAN SCHEME, as described by Mr. BELSHAM 27

Remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament . 74

Supplement to the Remarks on the Unitarian Version . . 107

III. SERMONS ON VARIOUS PUBLIC OCCASIONS:—

1. Before the Association for discountenancing Vice and promoting Religion and Virtue 311
2. For the National Thanksgiving on account of the Providential Deliverance of Ireland from Invasion . . . 351
3. On the Death of John, Earl of Clare, Lord Chancellor of Ireland 373

2066975

Page

IV. VISITATION CHARGES:—

1. To the Clergy of the Diocese of Raphoe 399
2. At the Primary Visitation of the Archdiocese of Dublin . 429
3. To the Clergy of Dublin.—The Principle of Union between Church and State in Christian Communities, explained; and its validity defended against the fictions of Warburton and the usurpations of popery 461

V. INDEXES:—

1. Of Texts explained or referred to 501
2. Of principal Matters 515
3. Of Books referred to in the Discourses and Dissertations on the Atonement 535

ILLUSTRATIONS

AND

EXPLANATORY DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES

OF

ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE,

CONCLUDED.

ILLUSTRATIONS

AND

EXPLANATORY DISSERTATIONS.

NO. LXX.—ON THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ANNUAL EXPIATION UNDER THE LAW, AND THE ONE GREAT EXPIATION UNDER THE GOSPEL.

Vol. I., page 41. (c).—The sacrifice on the anniversary of expiation seems to be distinguished from all others by a peculiar degree of solemnity, as if to mark its more immediate reference to the great sacrifice of Christ. Thus, on this day, we find the *High Priest* exclusively commanded to officiate: and on this day alone, in the stated exercises of his office, was he *permitted* to enter into the *Holy of Holies*, and to carry the blood of the victim into the *presence* of God, to offer it before that *Glory*, which, seated between the two cherubims, overshadowed the mercy seat, and represented the Divinity: —a circumstance, which the Apostle particularly marks (Hebr. chap. ix.) as prefiguring the entrance of our great High Priest, with the blood offered by him for our redemption, into the true presence of the most High, the immediate habitation of God's holiness and glory. The *High* Priest also seems to have been selected for the solemn services of this day, as more adequately representing the *whole* assembly, in whose name he sacrificed and supplicated forgiveness; and therefore more properly typifying him, who, representing the whole human race, was to procure redemption by his blood for the whole assembly of mankind.

Whoever wishes for a more minute detail of the particulars of this solemn sacrifice, and of its peculiar fitness to represent the sacrifice of Christ, may consult *Outram de Sacr.* lib. 1. cap. xviii. § 6, 7; lib. 2. cap. iii. § 2, 3, 4. He will also receive much satisfaction, from an examination of *Ainsworth's* comment on the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. For many valuable remarks, connected with the subject of this Number, *Daubeny's Discourses on the Connexion between the Old and New Test.* may be consulted. And in *Rhenferdius's* treatise *De Comparatione Expiationis Anniv. Pontificis Max. V. et N. Test.* (*Meuschen's Nov. Test.*, &c., pp. 1013—1039,) a most copious and circumstantial enumeration is given of the particulars, in which the annual expiation by the Jewish High Priest resembled the one great Expiation of the New Testament. It may be proper to observe, that such is the force of the resemblance, that Socinus himself admits this anniversary sacrifice of atonement,—inasmuch as "it was of special divine ordinance, at a stated season, offered by the High Priest, and appointed to atone for *all* the sins of *all* the people," —to be fairly accounted typical of the sacrifice of Christ.— *Socin. Oper.* (*Prælect. Theol.* cap. xxii.) tom. i. p. 583.

NO. LXXI.—ON THE NATURE AND IMPORT OF THE CEREMONY OF THE SCAPE-GOAT.

VOL. I., page 42. (a).—On this, see what has been said in pp. 239, 240, of vol. i., and attend particularly to the 5th, 7th, and 10th verses of the 16th chap. of Leviticus, from which it appears, that the *two goats* are, throughout the chapter, spoken of as *one* sin-offering; being expressly so *called* in the first of these verses; presented *jointly* as the offering of the people in the second; and, though separated into two distinct *parts* by the lot cast in the 9th verse, yet *each* described as contributing to the *atonement* for the people, as appears from the 10th verse compared with the 17th. Indeed, that the *two goats* made but *one* sin-offering on this occasion, the best commentators freely admit. See *Jame-*

son's observations on this chap. of Leviticus. The reason of this seems obvious. The death of the animal was requisite to represent the *means* by which the expiation was effected: and the bearing away the sins of the people on the head of the animal was requisite to exhibit the *effect;* namely, the removal of the guilt. But, for these distinct objects, two animals were necessary to complete the sin-offering.

It must be allowed, that an account somewhat different has been given of this matter by some very judicious commentators. The goat sent into the wilderness, and that which was offered up in expiation, jointly, they say, typify the great Redeemer of mankind: the former animal exhibiting that, which could not be displayed by the latter, as having been slain; namely, that Christ was not only to be *delivered for our offences,* but to be *raised again for our justification* (Rom. iv. 25); and that although he was to be *crucified through weakness,* yet he was to *live by the power of God.* (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) Thus *Ainsworth, Bochart, Alting,* and, before them, *Augustine* and *Procopius,* understand it. The opinion of these writers, respecting the truth to be illustrated by the dismissal of the second goat, may perhaps not improperly be combined with that which has been here proposed: so that whilst the goat which was slain exemplifies the Sacrifice offered for the sins of mankind; that which was sent away alive may represent, not only the removal of those sins in consequence of that sacrifice, but also the restoration to life of Him by whom they were so removed. Whether, however, this point be admitted or not, the circumstance of the two goats jointly constituting one offering, by exhibiting the different adjuncts, cannot, I think, with any reason be controverted.

Rhenferd contends, that this point is completely established by an evidence resulting from the nature of the ceremony itself. For, he says, the imposition of hands, and the confession and implied translation of sins upon the victim, being usual in the sacrifice of animals in expiation; and this ceremony being omitted in the case of the goat that was slain,

whilst it was employed in the case of the goat that was sent away; decidedly prove, that both animals were designed to be considered as one offering, and that the latter, consequently, represented Him who was to bear the sins of Israel, and by his sufferings to expiate and to remove them.—See *Jac. Rhenferd. exp. anniv.*, &c., p. 1033, of *Meuschen, Nov. Test. ex Talm.*

Whoever may have a curiosity to know whether any, and what ceremony, analogous to that of the Scape-goat, is observed by the Jews of modern times, on the *day of Expiation*, may turn to vol. i. pp. 177, 178, where he will find that a *cock* is now substituted for the legal victims; and that the entrails of the animal to which the sins of the offerers are conceived to have been transferred by imprecation, are exposed upon the top of the house, to be carried away by the birds into their solitary haunts, in like manner as, under the law, the scape-goat had been conceived to carry away the sins of the people into the wilderness. See also *Buxtorf. Synag. Jud.* and *Broughton's Dictionary of Religions*, Article EXPIATION.

NO. LXXII.—SOCINIAN OBJECTIONS URGED BY A DIVINE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE VICARIOUS IMPORT OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, AND AGAINST OTHER DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

VOL. I., page 42. (b).—The arguments in behalf of the vicarious import of the Mosaic sacrifices, have been so fully examined in Numbers XXXVIII. and XXXIX., that nothing need here be added to what has been already offered upon this head.

It is with great regret that, in reverting to this subject, I feel myself obliged to notice the following observations; which have been recently hazarded by a *Divine of the Established Church*, with a rashness and a flippancy which cannot too strongly be condemned.

"Those who seek a protection for their absurd and unscriptural ideas of a vicarious punishment, under the shelter

of the Jewish ritual, do not consider that that ritual was *solely* intended to preserve the Jews from the idolatry and polytheism of the neighbouring nations, by keeping their imagination sensibly interested, their minds perpetually employed, and their time continually occupied with the performance of rites and ceremonies, sacrifices and oblations, which all tended to keep alive in their minds the unity of the Godhead; and thus to preserve them a distinct people, till the time appointed came for the opening of the Christian dispensation; when the distinction between Jew and Gentile was to be done away[a]. There are, I know, some people *whose fancy is*

[a] The same idea this author takes pains frequently to enforce. In his *Religion without Cant*, (p. 112,) he states it thus.—"The ceremonial laws of the Mosaic dispensation were intended *merely* to preserve unbroken the barrier between Jew and Gentile, till the coming of him," &c.—And yet, will it be believed, that in the very same page, this determined enemy of every thing typical in the Mosaic dispensation, affirms, that in the Mosaical law, the *great scheme of redemption* was obscurely insinuated, rather than distinctly pourtrayed, in *types and figures*, in the *sacrifices* of the altar, and the *atonements* of the Priest? The *Redeemer*, he adds, "was *seen through the rites of the Mosaic dispensation*, as through a veil or a glass, darkly." How then does this "wise and sober" writer differ from those, "whose fancy prevailing over their judgment" has led them to view the Mosaic dispensation as containing in it something typical of the Christian? He admits, that the *sacrifices* and *atonements* under the one, did obscurely typify the *great scheme of Redemption* in the other. And who contends that the type was any other than a faint and obscure draught of the reality? Thus, then, he saves his reader the trouble of confuting the assertion, that the Jewish ritual was *solely* intended to form a barrier between Jew and Gentile, and that none but a visionary could ever have dreamt of its bearing a typical relation to the Christian scheme.

This is not the only case, in which the freedom and variety of this author's views have led him to mutually confronting positions on the same subject. —To select one instance more out of a rich abundance.—In p. 179, of the last named work, he tells the Christian, that "it is only by personal acts of sin, *hardening into habits* of sin, that he becomes a transgressor, subject to the wrath of God;" and, agreeably to this, he asserts again, in p. 210, that "it is not by some occasional misdoings that we are to pass sentence on any man;" —that, "in estimating the worth of the human character, we are not to form our calculations on the conduct of one single day, but to take the average of many days and years, and see what *proportion* a man's *violation* of his duty bears to its *performance*, his *virtues* to his *vices*, his *sins* to his *righteousness*." —And yet this indulgent moralist, who had thus far endeavoured to relieve us from any inconvenient pressure of sin upon our consciences, by enabling us to reduce the balance against us in the debtor and creditor account of transgression and righteousness, shortly after turns upon us, all at once, with this unpleasant sentence: "*The moment* we have violated *any one* duty of truth, justice, and humanity, or any one saying of the perfect law of Christ, *that*

stronger than their judgment, who *suppose* that the varied sacrifices and ordinances of the Mosaic ritual, and indeed all the fractional parts of the Mosaic dispensation, were intended only as types and figures of particular facts and doctrines in the history and institution of the Messiah.—*Those, whose minds are not fitted for larger and grander views of the ways of God, may well employ their time in these puerile conceits; but they will be despised by wise and sober men, who do not like to assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjuror.*"—*The Guide to Immortality, by Robert Fellowes*, vol. iii. pp. 55, 56.

Such are the modest insinuations of a divine, whose mind *is* of course "fitted for large and grand views of the ways of God;" whose comprehensive ken enables him, although unaided by any lights from Scripture, to discern what was the *sole* design of the Jewish ritual; who is possessed of "a judgment," that at once detects the silly fancies of all such as "suppose" that that ritual could bear any relation to the Messiah; and who is also "wise and sober" enough, to "despise" all those, who, by forming such a supposition, "assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjuror."

Now, who are the persons, who, by forming such strange suppositions, and by indulging in such "puerile conceits," have rendered themselves the objects of this gentleman's contempt? Not to speak of the person alluded to in the last note, (who probably stands too well with the author, to be exposed to any portion of that scorn which is to be shared among those who entertain such notions,) one of the first and most distinguished in this way is the Apostle Paul. *He* has gone the unreasonable length of endeavouring to prove, in a most minute and laboured detail, that the institutions of the Law were but shadows of things to come. But then, of St.

moment we are polluted with guilt, and, without repentance, obnoxious to punishment." See p. 220.—Really, it were by no means unadvisable, that a writer (not excepting even a teacher of theology) should take some little pains to know what his own opinions were, before he proposed them for the instruction of the public.

Paul, and his various "puerile conceits," this writer makes no account. The Apostle, he inform us, "labours with mysterious meanings, *which he fails in developing with sufficient perspicuity*."—"He was of the sect of the Pharisees, who were wont to allegorize on the literal sense of Scripture. His writings have a tincture of *cabalistical* refinement,—and even occasionally *glimmer with a ray of Grecian philosophy*." "The Epistle to the Romans is *bewildered* with the polemical Christianity of that day."—His Epistles, generally, are "filled with the abstruse discussions of *Rabbinical* learning; or relate to questions which are at present of *more curiosity than importance*."—"A modern believer has" (consequently) "very little concern with any of the Epistles of this Apostle;" or indeed, it must be added, with any of the Epistles, all of which this writer finds to be "involved in a tenfold obscurity;" and to which he pronounces it impossible that we could ever pay the smallest attention, but that "we prefer stumbling in darkness; that we delight more in error than in truth; or that we imagine there is no piety where there is no mystery."—*Picture of Christian Philosophy*, Pref. pp. iv—vi; pp. 131, 132.—See also *Guide to Immort.* vol. iii. pp. 230, 231, where the same point is again earnestly enforced. In another work, (*Relig. without Cant*, pp. 13, 14,) the same author takes care to acquaint his reader more particularly with those *pharisaical dogmas* and *heathenish notions*, which St. Paul had so deeply imbibed; and he illustrates the power of ancient *prejudices* over the mind of the Apostle, by a happy and elegant allusion to the *tang of the tainted cask;* which, as he has presented it in a Latin phrase, likely to excite attention from its *novelty*, will, he thinks, give to "the sagacious" a sufficient idea of his meaning.

Of his meaning, in truth, no person can entertain a doubt. His language is plain and intelligible enough. It is neither more nor less than this; that St. Paul, and, indeed, the Authors of all the Apostolical Epistles, have shown themselves to be mere drivellers: that we should consequently reject all their fancies; discard the hitherto received *doc-*

trines of Christianity, as idle dreams; and regard the Gospel *merely* and *exclusively* as a *moral system*, or, as he chooses sometimes to term it, as *a rule of life*. This is the point which this writer mainly labours to establish throughout his various theological[a] publications. And, for the purpose of effecting this, he strenuously contends that the Christian religion contains in it *no* doctrine that is *mysterious*[b]; that it

[a] *The Anticalvinist, A Picture of Christian Philosophy, Religion without Cant*, and *The Guide to Immortality*, are the works with which this author has favoured the public on theological subjects. [Another theological work has, I understand, issued from the same pen, since the time at which this note was written: but what the nature of its contents may be, I confess I have not been anxious to discover.]—In these several volumes, all largely descanting upon the morality, to the disparagement, or rather to the exclusion, of the doctrines of the Gospel, the Christian excellence which forms the favourite theme, is *benevolence*. It were well if he had treated those from whose opinions he thinks proper to dissent with that mildness, and brotherly forbearance, which might prove him to have written under the influence of the virtue which he so highly praises. His language, on the contrary, is everywhere that of the bitterest rancour, and the most arrogant contempt, against all who embrace the doctrines which he rejects, and which, in subscribing the articles of the Church to which he belongs, he bound himself by a solemn promise to maintain. Nay, he even dooms to the place of future torments, in common with the most profligate and abandoned of sinners, all who have taught the "false and pernicious doctrines of innate depravity, imputed righteousness, and such other dogmas as are contrary to goodness."—*Guide to Immort.* vol. i. p. 316. Yet with all this gall perpetually discharging itself, charity and the kindly affections are the never-ending topics of declamation; a declamation even sometimes swelling into pindaric.

Love, indeed, of one kind or other, is with this writer so favourite a theme, that a late work, in which he has indulged in the effusions of poetry, is exclusively devoted to the subject. It must be confessed, however, that the love there treated of is as far removed from *Christian* love, as any that a *Christian minister* could feel himself justified in recommending.—*Poems chiefly descriptive of the softer and more delicate sensations and emotions of the heart!* Surely, surely, there is mischievous stuff enough of this kind abroad, without calling in the clergy to contribute *their* stock of silly *love-songs*, to the increase of the nuisance.—And yet, perhaps, the love-songs of this clergyman are not more mischievous than his theology. They certainly are not more poetic.

[b] "In the following work, it will perhaps be objected that I have introduced no mysteries: but whatever is mysterious is unnecessary. The essentials of a religion consist in few, and those the plainest truths."—"*False* religions may extol the importance of *mysteries:* but there is no mystery in the true."—*Guide to Immortality*, vol. i. pref. p. xiv.—Similar language is scattered plentifully amongst the pages of this work. Being thus prepared to render all perfectly smooth throughout the Gospels, and the Epistles being altogether discarded, our author proceeds with his pruning-knife in his hand, and freely and unsparingly lops or bends every thing to his own wish, and, as he conceives, to the great edifi-

pronounces a good *moral* life to be the *only* requisite condition[a] of salvation; that in the Gospels alone are to be

cation of his reader. And yet, strange to say, notwithstanding his *plain reasoning*, which "all men in the possession of reason may understand," he has left behind him mysteries not less than those which he boasts to have removed; if that which cannot be comprehended be allowed to be mysterious. Amongst many such, his observations upon the Incarnation and the Atonement supply notable specimens. The very opening of his work, indeed, cannot fail to satisfy all who examine it, of his qualifications as a commentator, who is to remove from the sacred writings all the obscurities of mystery. Confessing that he cannot discover what meaning should be assigned to the word Λόγος, he "gives no translation to this *mysterious* term, but retains in the text the original word *Logos*, to which he leaves every reader at liberty to annex whatever interpretation he may think best." (Vol. i. p. 3.) —This is certainly a new mode of removing a difficulty: and Mr. F. is evidently not quite satisfied with it himself. He, therefore, in the succeeding notes, calls in the aid of Dr. Lardner, and labours, with the help of this Socinian ally, to explain the nature of that, the term to express which he does not venture to translate. And now the matter comes out, that this *Logos*, let the word mean what it may, must actually be *God himself*. For if it be the *reason*, the *wisdom*, or the *power* of God, then what but *God himself* can it be?—Thus the first point gained in making the matter plain, is, that the *attribute* of any Being *is* that *Being*.—Well, then, this *Logos* is actually *God himself*. How goes on the *plain reasoning* now? *In the beginning was God; and* GOD WAS WITH GOD; *and* GOD WAS GOD. —So far there is no mystery undoubtedly; nor yet in the succeeding assurance, that *God was in the beginning with God*. And for such communications, it must be conceded to Mr. F. and his Socinian auxiliaries, that the Evangelists could have but little need of inspiration. But as we advance a little farther, we find that this *Logos* (that is, *God*) is called *The Light*; and that this *Light*, which in one verse is *God*, becomes, in the next, the *Messiah*, "the visible image of the wisdom of God;" and that immediately after it becomes *God* again.—(See the notes, pp. 3—7, vol. i. of *Guide*, &c.)—So much for the freedom from mystery, and clearness of exposition, in which this author exults; and for the want of which he everywhere indulges in the most indignant invectives against such as give support to the creeds and articles of the Established Church; all of whom, indiscriminately, he never fails to abuse as ignorant and intolerant, in a manner that evidently marks where these terms may justly be applied.

A glance at the exposition of the introductory verses of St. John's Gospel, as given in pp. 53, 54 of the first vol. of this work, will satisfy the reader, with what associates this *Church of England* divine is to be ranked in his comments upon Scripture.

[a] *Guide to Immor.* vol. i. p. 327.—This is also the familiar language of Mr. F. throughout. The clergy, he says, (Vol. i. p. 323,) "ought solely and exclusively to be the *moral teachers* of the people." (He means to say, that the clergy "ought to be solely and exclusively *moral* teachers of the people.") Indeed he carries this point so far, that he would have "the ministers of the Establishment COMPELLED to teach *nothing* but that pure morality which Christ taught, without any *cant* or *mystery*."—*Religion without Cant*, p. 131.—It has been remarked of the work so entitled, — which deals, *usque ad nauseam*, in the cant or common-place usual with a certain class of writers on the subjects of *liberality, benevolence, morality*, &c., blended, at the same time,

found comprised every useful truth and every religious duty; and that consequently in his own work, which professes to give a just view of whatever the Gospels teach, the Christian reader will meet "a faithful and a cheering *Guide to Immortality*." The author goes yet farther: he holds, that our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount "contains a summary of *every thing* which it is necessary to believe or to practise." (*Anticalvinist*, pp. 13. 25.) So that even his own three volumes, explanatory of the true meaning of the four Evangelists, are in a great degree superfluous; inasmuch as the substance of a few chapters which have been given by one of them, comprehends all that is actually requisite. This is undoubtedly making brief work with the writings of the New Testament: and, in this view of the case, he might with as much propriety have entitled his book, a *short cut*, as a *cheering guide, to immortality*.

But that we may appreciate the more justly the value of this writer's theological opinions, it is necessary to observe, that, whilst he everywhere[a] insists on the propriety of confining the entire range of Christian instruction within the limits of our Lord's discourses, as recorded by the Evangelists, he at the same time very candidly informs us, that some of the grandest and most important truths of Christianity were not made known to the Apostles until after their Master's death. "The great *mystery* of a *suffering* Messiah," he says,

(in the indulgence it is to be presumed of benevolent and moral feelings,) with no small portion of the cant of *invective* against all the supporters of the Established religion,—that instead of being denominated *Religion without Cant*, it might by a slight transposition have acquired a much more appropriate description, *Cant without Religion*.

[a] Besides what has been already quoted upon this subject, in p. 7, we find the following remarks in this writer's *Guide to Imm.* vol. iii. p. 231.—"Those, who prefer religious speculation to the practice of religion, or who wish to keep alive the memory and to rekindle the heat of controversies, whose lustre and whose interest have long since been lost in the night of ages, may dedicate the best portion of their days to the *fruitless study of that imperviously dark and inextricably bewildering polemical matter*, which is still preserved in the Apostolical Epistles."—"But the precepts of Christ, as they are contained in his various parables and discourses in the four Evangelists, contain *all* the instructions which are necessary to our improvement in righteousness;—include, in short, every essential principle of genuine Christianity.

(and with what consistency he talks of *such* a mystery, or of *any* mystery whatever, let the reader judge,) "could not prudentially be explained, and was not openly and unreservedly taught, till after his resurrection. (*Guide*, &c., vol. i. p. 344.) In the sentence preceding this he takes care to state distinctly, that, during the life of our Lord, this knowledge was withheld even from his immediate followers. Neither could it have been communicated to them, in the interval between the resurrection and ascension, consistently with the representation of the case which this author gives: for he particularly acquaints us (which he admits to be more than the Evangelists themselves have done) with the subjects of our Lord's discourse during that interval. "It was principally occupied with instructions relative to their (the Apostles') ministry," &c. But "*all things necessary for the belief or the practice of men*, and which are essential to salvation, our Lord had *repeatedly* inculcated on his disciples *before his death*." And, accordingly, "the Apostles delivered nothing necessary to salvation, which Christ had not previously enjoined in his discourses to his disciples; and of which we have a copious summary in the writings of the Evangelists." (*Guide*, &c., vol iii. pp. 229, 230.)—What now follows from all this?—That "*the great mystery of a suffering Messiah*" is of no importance in the Christian scheme. For nothing is important that is not contained in our Lord's discourses delivered before his death, and as they are given to us by the Evangelists: and in these discourses, we are told, the subject of a suffering Messiah is carefully suppressed.

But we have not yet done with the *variety* of the author's views upon this head. He has again and again assured us, that our Lord had, in several discourses before his death, communicated to his disciples every important truth: and yet he freely confesses, in other places, that there were several important truths which were not so communicated, but which our Lord had promised to convey to his disciples by the Spirit of truth, whom he would send to them after his death. (*Guide*, vol. iii. p. 64.)—It is true, indeed, that as to

this *Holy Spirit*, or *Paraclete*, Mr. F. questions[a], (p. 63,) "whether it may not simply signify Christ's RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION!" This, however, he proposes only to the "*dispassionate and deep-thinking*."—But what again shall we say of the Evangelical narration, as Mr. F. describes the matter in another place? (p. 68.) "*After my resurrection*, I will declare to you *the will and counsels of the Father without any indistinctness or obscurity*." And yet to this he immediately subjoins: "The sacred historians have only *very briefly* recited the discourses of Jesus with his disciples *after his resurrection*."—Thus, then, "*the will and counsels of the Father*," the *expounding in all the Scriptures* (*beginning from Moses and all the prophets*) *the things concerning himself*, —which were vouchsafed by Christ to his disciples after his resurrection, and which the Evangelists have (not "*briefly*," but) not at all "recited," are to be sought for precisely where it is confessed that they are not: and the Gospels are alone to be referred to, for clear and distinct views of doctrines, which the Gospels do not contain: whilst that part of Scripture is to be rejected as unnecessary, and even injurious, which was specially allotted to the purpose of communicating to mankind that knowledge of the truth, which the Spirit of truth, as well as the words of our Lord, conveyed to the Apostles, subsequently to his resurrection.

Thus we find this writer, who is to clear away all mystery

[a] "It is a question, which may be proposed to calm and dispassionate and deep-thinking men, whether our Lord, under the idea of a Paraclete or Counsellor, spoke of his resurrection and ascension; events which so greatly contributed to dispel the prejudices, to enlighten the minds, and to elevate the hearts of his disciples; and, in short, to lead them into all truth."—So much for *plain, unrefined, natural* exposition. Now, if, in speaking of the Comforter that was to be sent, our Lord meant his resurrection and ascension, it is evident that we may substitute these words for that which they imply, wherever it is spoken of. And then, our Lord's address to his disciples would run thus: "If I go not away, *my resurrection and ascension* will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him (i. e. *my resurrection and ascension*) unto you. And when he is come," &c. "However, when he cometh, even the Spirit of truth, (or, in other words, *my resurrection and ascension*,) he will guide you into all truth: for he (that is, *my resurrection and ascension*) will not speak of himself," &c.—I certainly must leave this to "the dispassionate and deep-thinking," for I find it quite beyond the reach of *my* comprehension.

and difficulty from Scripture truth, perpetually at variance with himself, no less than with the real doctrines of Christianity. Surely, he should have endeavoured to form at least a *consistent* set of opinions, before he attempted to obtrude them on the public; and, more particularly before he ventured to fly in the face of the whole Christian world, by an open rejection of one of the most important portions of inspired Scripture. Humility, however, is not one of the *weaknesses* of this writer: and certainly knowledge is not his *forte*.—Any reply to the arguments advanced by Mr. Fellowes, for the rejection of the Epistles in the investigation of the Christian doctrines, is rendered unnecessary by the arguments themselves. Independently of their extravagance, (I had almost said, their folly,) they carry in them, as we have seen, their own refutation. In truth, the object of our Saviour's life was to supply the subject, not to promulgate the doctrines, of the Gospel. The Evangelists, therefore, confine themselves to the simple duty of narration: and the doctrines, which altogether depended upon what our Lord had done and suffered, particularly upon his death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, were, after this groundwork was fairly laid, to be fully set forth by those, to whom our blessed Saviour had solemnly promised the unerring aid of the Holy Spirit, and who were especially designated by him for that very purpose. See pp. 303—305 of vol. i. for farther observations upon the attempt made by Dr. Priestley and his Socinian phalanx, similar to this of Mr. F.'s, to beat down the authority of the Epistles. By rejecting the Epistles, or, which is the same thing, the doctrines which they contain, Mr F. indeed thinks that he may[a] reconcile "Jews, Turks, and Infidels of what-

[a] Upon this prudential plan of clearing away mysteries from Christianity, in order to bring infidels of all descriptions within its pale, I cannot avoid noticing the observations of a writer, whose opinions deserve at least as much respect as those of Mr. *Fellowes*.—"As to the mysterious articles of our faith, which Infidels would by no means have us forget; "Who," say they, "can swallow them?" In truth, none but those who think it no dishonour to their understandings to credit their Creator. Socinus, like our Infidels, was one of a narrow throat; and out of a generous compassion to the Scriptures, (which the world, it seems, had misunderstood for 1500 years,) was for

ever denomination," to Christianity. (*Guide*, &c., vol. i. pref. p. xv.)—No; that he will not effect: but he will accomplish this,—he will render Christianity very little different from what Jews, Turks, and Infidels, have already embraced.

Thus then, upon the whole, it is manifest, that we have the very essence of Socinianism presented to us by a writer, in the garb of a minister of the Established Church: a writer, too, who expatiates in every page on the moral virtues; on the virtues of truth, honesty, and fidelity; whilst he openly boasts of the good policy of continuing in the bosom of that Communion which he labours to subvert; and exultingly avows his breach of those solemn engagements, by virtue of which he obtained admission within its pale. Such plain and unenlightened Christians, as have not acquired a relish for the refinements, which enable an ingenious casuist to violate his promise and to betray his trust, will be apt to suspect that, in this author's hands, Christianity has not only been abridged of its mysteries, but also curtailed somewhat in its morality. For what do those articles contain, to which every clergyman of the Established Church has declared his *entire and unfeigned assent*, but the very doctrines which this gentleman ridicules and rejects? Surely, the doctrines of the *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, the *Redemption*, and the various other momentous Christian truths, which they pronounce to be indispensable to the formation of a genuine Christian faith, are not to be found comprised in the Sermon

weeding them of their mysteries; and rendering them, in the plenitude of his infallible reason, undisgusting and palatable to all the *rational* part of mankind. *Why should honest Jews and Turks be frighted from us by the Trinity, &c.?* He was for making religion familiar and inoffensive. And so he did; and *unchristian* too."—The same admirable writer subjoins. "Those things which our hands can grasp, our understandings cannot comprehend. Why then deny to the Deity himself, the privilege of being *one amidst that multitude of mysteries*, which he has made?"—Such are the striking and just reflections of the celebrated Dr. *Young*, on this important subject, in his *Centaur not Fabulous* (p. 14); a work which, in this age of frivolity, voluptuousness, and irreligion, I would particularly recommend to the attention of my young reader, promising him in the perusal, not less entertainment from the liveliness of its illustrations and the brilliancy of its wit, than improvement from the soundness of its reasonings and the animation of its piety.

on the Mount, which this author maintains to be a "summary of *every thing, which it is necessary to believe or to practise.*"

It is, indeed, scarcely conceivable, how a person in the possession of a sane understanding can reconcile to himself subscription to the articles of any Church, and rejection of the doctrines which those articles define. To say, as this author does, that the *sixth* article, in pronouncing that nothing is to be received as an article of faith which is not founded in Holy Writ, supplies a dispensation from the obligation of the rest, is to make as short work with the articles of the Church, as he has already made with the canon of Scripture. Would it not, under these circumstances, have saved much unnecessary trouble, to reduce the articles of the Church to the single declaration of the sixth? Or, indeed, were we to seek the simplicity, which this author so strongly recommends, the sixth article itself must be yet farther reduced, to correspond to the just dimensions of Gospel truth; and the whole that our Church should pronounce to be requisite, for the true belief of a Christian teacher, should at once be confined to the range of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. But, to a person not desirous of escaping from the obligations of a solemn engagement, it would naturally occur, that the Church, in propounding certain articles of belief, could never have acted so absurdly, as to superadd to these one paramount article, which was to do away the obligation of all the rest. On the contrary, he would necessarily reason thus: that, whilst certain doctrines are proposed as articles of faith, and it is at the same time declared that none are to be received as such, which are not founded on the authority of Scripture; it is clearly intended to be conveyed, that the articles proposed *are* founded upon that authority, and to be received as articles of faith by those *only* who conceive them to be so founded.

The language which Mr. Fellowes's reasoning would put into the mouths of the framers of the articles, is rather whimsical. "*For the purpose of avoiding diversities of opinion,*

and the establishing of consent touching true religion[a], we require from the clergy of the Established Church of England an *unfeigned assent* to the several doctrines which we propose; and for the better effecting the aforesaid purpose, we also require of them, each for himself, according to his private interpretation of Scripture, to modify or to reject these doctrines at pleasure, and to introduce such diversities of opinion, as they may respectively think fit."—This is Mr. Fellowes's view of the matter. I would suggest to him a view of it somewhat different, in the words of one of the most distinguished ornaments of the English Church at the present day.—"*I do willingly and ex animo subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England*, is the indispensable form of subscription; and therefore it behoves every one, before he offers himself a candidate for holy orders, to peruse carefully the Articles of our Church, and *to compare them with the written word of God.* If, upon mature examination, he believes them to be authorized by Scripture, he may conscientiously subscribe them: but if, on the contrary, he thinks that he sees reason to dissent from any of the doctrines asserted in them, no hope of emolument or honour, no dread of inconvenience or disappointment, should induce him to express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe."[b]—(*Bishop Tomline's Elements*, &c., vol. ii. p. 567.)—According to Mr. *Fellowes's* reasoning, on the other hand, a Christian minister *may* express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe. And this is the writer who resolves the whole of Christianity into *morality.*

Juravi linguâ, mentem injuratam gero, is a sentiment which has seldom been so openly avowed, as by this gentle-

[a] The *Title* of our Articles, in describing the object for which they are framed, uses the very words which are here printed in Italics.

[b] Dr. *Balguy*, in speaking of the duties of the clergy, touching the articles, affirms, that "every word that comes from our mouths in opposition to the established faith, is a *violation of the most solemn engagements*, and an act of disobedience to lawful authority."

man. The dishonest subterfuge of *mental reservation* has been often charged upon that Church, against whose corruptions it has been the glory of ours to *protest*. It might[a] now with justice be retorted upon our own, if indeed it could (as I confidently trust it cannot) reasonably be supposed, that opinions on the subject of subscription, similar to those entertained by Mr. F., prevail in any degree amongst the clergy of the Establishment.

But, after all, we do not find this gentleman completely satisfied with his own views of the subject. In the wish, which he expresses[b], that Parliament should give relief from all subscriptions to doctrine, it is manifest, that he is not altogether contented with the *dispensation*, which he conceives the 6th article to supply. Whether Parliament, however, grant such relief or not, his free spirit is not to be restrained.—"When the Church of England got rid of *one* Pope, it never intended to raise up *thirty-nine* in its place."[c] (p. xxi.) And if the church presume to do so, he is at all

[a] It *has*, in truth, been retorted, in a late publication, by a Roman Catholic writer, and directed even against those of our clergy, who conceive themselves to be bound by their subscription to consider the articles merely as articles of *peace*. Even of these this author pronounces, that they must be allowed to have acted under impressions "contrary to every principle of Christian sincerity, and favourable to perjury." What then would the same writer have said of a minister of the Established Church, who, so far from viewing those Articles, to which he had solemnly declared his *unfeigned assent*, as Articles of *peace*, openly arraigns them as grossly *antiscriptural*, and professes it to be his determination to oppose and to overturn them by every means in his power?—The passage to which I have referred, is to be found at p. lvi. of the *Introduction* to a work, entitled *The Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church*.—The author of the *Introduction* (who styles himself *Irenæus*) possesses ability and information, worthy of a better cause than that which he has undertaken to support; and many things have fallen from his pen, in that treatise, which well deserve the consideration of Protestant divines.—I mention this the more willingly, because it has not been my lot to meet with publications by any late writer of the Romish Church, alike deserving of notice.

[b] *Guide to Imm.* vol. i. pp. xviii, xix.

[c] It is curious to observe this advocate for Christian freedom, who spurns with such indignation these Popes which are imposed by the authority of the Church, devising at the same time a Pope of his own, to which he would have the whole body of the clergy *compelled* to bend the knee. For, as we have already seen, (note [a], pp. 9, 10,) his favourite plan is, that the ministers of the Establishment should be COMPELLED to teach nothing but pure morality. Thus, like most of the other mighty advocates for freedom, the liberty which he wishes for, is merely the liberty to deprive others of theirs.

events released from such iniquitous exercise of authority, by a duty of higher obligation,—the duty which he owes to the great spiritual King. (p. xxi—xxiii.) But it may be asked, whether this duty authorizes him to betray his trust, by voluntarily continuing a member of a particular communion, which he labours, in violation of the most solemn engagements, to overturn; labours to overturn, by the very means which his connexion with that communion supplies; and the enjoyment of which means, he pretty plainly intimates to be the principal cause for which he maintains that connexion. (pp. xix, xx.)

It is, however, but fair to state, that, in this deliberate endeavour to overturn the doctrines which the articles enforce, this author considers himself by no means chargeable with a violation of his engagements. The argument indeed is somewhat new. It amounts to this: that he who attends to the direct, natural, and obvious meaning of the articles, is least likely to arrive at their right construction: and that, as to the letter, they are in truth more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Whoever doubts this to be a fair representation, may turn to the pages last referred to; and also to pp. 33—42 of *Relig. without Cant*, where we find the author more fully unfolding the entire mystery of his reasoning upon this subject;—for *mystery* and *paradox* this author does not dislike, where they are of his own creation. It is there laid down, authoritatively, that the true meaning of the articles is not to be collected from the articles themselves, but from the sense of the clergy at large; who, it is affirmed, "may put *any* construction[a] upon them which they think best:" that,

[a] Dr. *Paley*, a writer certainly not of the same stamp with Mr. Fellowes, gives a very different account of this matter. "Subscription to Articles of Religion, though no more than a *declaration* of the subscriber's assent, may properly enough be considered in connexion with the subject of OATHS, because it is governed by the same rule of interpretation; which rule is the ANIMUS IMPONENTIS. The inquiry, therefore, concerning subscription, will be, *quis imposuit, et quo animo?*"—(*Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, p. 148.)—This is manifestly an inquiry, of a nature very far removed from that which Mr. F. recommends to us. And, although I cannot agree with Dr. *Paley* either as to his general notion of the *intent* of the articles, or as to his idea, that the ANIMUS IMPONENTIS *terminates* with the legislature that enacted them, yet it cannot, I think, be reasonably denied, that he proposes the true

"according to that construction, the articles may and ought to be subscribed;" and that he, who thus subscribes them, inasmuch as he maintains a unity of doctrine with the majority of his brethren, "is a better friend to the Church of England, than he is, who may subscribe the articles in a sense more agreeable to the letter," &c.—Thus we are informed by a writer, who boasts of not submitting his opinions to authority, that we are not to exercise our private judgment in discovering the true sense of the articles, but to take it entirely on trust from others. This however turns out, in the conclusion, to be, after all, but a convenient mode of rendering the whole dependent upon the judgment of the very individual, who thus modestly disclaims its exercise. For,

principle of their interpretation. A just corrective of the laxity with which Dr. *Paley applies* that principle, may be found in Mr. *Gisborne's Principles of Moral Philosophy*, pp. 190—192. To this work, as well as to *Bishop Tomline's Elements*, I would earnestly advise the divinity student to resort for accurate notions upon this subject. Very loose opinions have been scattered abroad, by various writers, upon this point; a point, which of all others demands a most conscientious precision. But of all these writers, none, perhaps, of any note, has advanced a more relaxed system, than the late Cambridge Professor, Dr. *Hey*, who, in his *Lectures on Divinity*, however much of learning and good sense they may otherwise contain, has certainly merited the charge made by Bishop Law, of leading the members of the Church "into all the labyrinths of a loose and a perfidious casuistry." (Vol. ii. p. 13.) His description of the nature of the *tacit repeal* adopted by the *Church of Geneva*, (vol. ii. p. 56,) and his manifest recommendation of it as an example to be followed by other churches, will supply a sufficient proof of the truth of this assertion.—Dr. *Powell*, again, another eminent member of the University of Cambridge, has given but too much colour, by certain expressions of his in his *Discourse on Subscriptions*, for the wild opinions of Mr. *Fellowes* upon this subject: although when well considered, and in connexion with the context, they will be found to give him no support. The following observations of this writer deserve to be quoted. Speaking of the subscription of the *clergy*, he says: "Our articles of Religion are not merely articles of Peace. They are designed also as a test of our opinions. For, since it cannot be imagined, that men should explain with clearness, or enforce with earnestness, or defend with accuracy of judgment, such doctrines as they do not believe; the Church requires of those, who are appointed to teach religion, a solemn declaration of their faith. Nor is it more unreasonable to exclude a man from this office, who, through error, unavoidable suppose, and innocent error, is unfit to execute it; than to deny him a single employment, for which he is accidentally disqualified. He, therefore, who assents to our articles, must have examined them, and be convinced of their truth."—*Dr. Powell's Discourses on various Subjects*, pp. 33, 34. The whole of this passage is well worthy of attention.

since all is now to be decided by the suffrage of the clergy, and since there is no practicable contrivance whereby this suffrage can be numerically collected, the sense of the majority must, of course, be precisely that which each individual may *conceive* it to be. But, again, as it is not merely "the majority of the living members," but "particularly the most learned, upright, and judicious members of the Church of England, that constitute that Church;" it must be the sense of the majority of these, it is manifest, that is to determine the point. Now who are the *most learned, upright*, and *judicious* members of that Church? These clearly *can* be no other than they who reject all *mystery;* who make Christianity nothing but a *moral* rule; who can discern in it nothing more than Dr. Priestley, or Mr. Belsham, or any other free expositor who would divest it of all its peculiarities; who, in short, agree with Mr. Fellowes, in pronouncing the entire sum and substance of the Christian religion to be comprised in Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Thus, then, it appears, that our author ends where he began, and that the true meaning of the articles as well as the genuine sense of Scripture, is to be collected only from him who has supplied us with *The Guide to Immortality.*

Now what is all this less than insanity? But it is the insanity of a vain mind, of which we see too many instances on religious subjects daily. Well might a periodical writer, whose attachment to religious truth entitles him to general praise, describe this writer as "presumptuous, idolizing his own conceptions, and fancying his own reason infallible, and cutting short the line of faith, exactly where it happens to interfere with their suggestions.—Already" (it is added)[a] "he is a latitudinarian in the widest sense of the word: the natural progress is from that to a fanciful, self-willed, merely nominal Christian; making even the Gospels bend to his own whim. From this point the descent to Deism or even

[a] It should be observed, that these remarks were drawn forth by one of the earliest of this writer's performances. He has since travelled farther in the same direction; and given additional proof of the justice of those animadversions, and the truth of those prognostics.

Atheism is perfectly easy: nor do we know, indeed, that a Deist differs much, except in name, from such a Christian."

Mr. F. has, it is true, congratulated himself on his good fortune, in being the subject of these animadversions of the *British Critic;* as they have furnished the occasion of his "receiving so much elegance of praise, from one who is equally distinguished by the vigour of his intellect, and the fervour of his benevolence." (*Relig. without Cant*, pref. p. xxxviii.)—That Dr. *Parr* has proved his *benevolence*, by the high panegyric which he has bestowed upon Mr. F., there can be no question; but whether he has done equal credit to his *intellect*, or, what is of more consequence, whether he has served the cause of truth and of Christianity, by such indulgence of that amiable feeling, is certainly much to be doubted. Had Dr. *Parr* confined himself to the testimony which he has borne to the purity and benevolence [a] displayed in the private life of Mr. *Fellowes*, as he is a competent, so he would have been admitted to be an unexceptionable witness. But, in speaking of an author, whose works are before the public, Dr. *Parr*, however highly his learning and talents may be (and highly they ought to be) rated, yet cannot pos-

[a] Dr. *Parr* speaks in terms altogether unmeasured of the *benevolent* and *charitable* feelings which uniformly govern the life and guide the pen of Mr. *Fellowes*. And yet it is an extraordinary effect of those benevolent and charitable feelings, that he should everywhere throughout his writings pour forth the language of virulence and contempt against all who support the creeds and articles of the Church, against all, in short, who deem any thing beyond his abridged form of Christianity necessary for a Christian. Perhaps even from the writings of the most illiberal bigot a stronger instance of the want of charity cannot be adduced than that which this author supplies, (as has been noticed, p. 8,) in speaking of those, who "teach the false and pernicious doctrines of *innate depravity, imputed righteousness*," &c. In short, it is of a writer, who has war continually in his mouth, that Dr. *Parr* pronounces peace to be for ever in his heart. It is almost ludicrous to see such a writer represented as using in his own person the language of Grotius, "Pacem amavi semper amoque," even in the qualified sense in which this pacific disposition is described. (*Spital Sermon*, p. 82.) —Dr. Parr's universal acquaintance with the ancient classics will readily suggest to him whose language I use, when (without being deterred by the "tales pacis hostes insurrecturos," &c.) I beg to substitute for the foregoing the following description, as more aptly illustrative of the character of his friend, —"Ωστε εἴ τις, αὐτὸς ξυνίλων, φαίη πιφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν, μήτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ἐᾶν, ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴποι.

sibly expect, that the opinion, which he thinks fit to pronounce upon that author's productions, shall necessarily regulate the public decision. Perhaps, indeed, in the declarations which this classical and most elaborate writer has hazarded on the subject of Mr. *Fellowes's* theological publications, although nothing can shake his reputation as a scholar, he may not have added much to his character as a divine. For when he tells us, that he finds but "*two or three points of controversial divinity* in which he dissents from Mr. *Fellowes*," (who in *almost every point* of controversial divinity dissents from the Articles of the Established Church:) and that he discovers scarcely any thing to be objected to, except "that Mr. F. does not assent to some positions of Mr. *Wilberforce*[a] about original sin; for the attempt to refute whom, some enlightened believers may applaud, and some orthodox churchmen would pardon him:"—when he tells us these things, he proves beyond a doubt, either that he has perused Mr. F.'s writings with an eye of blamable partiality, where the cause of religious truth demanded an honest search and even a piercing scrutiny; or that his own opinions hang but loosely and uncertainly upon the point of orthodoxy. Dr. *Parr* needs not to be informed, that the truths of Christianity are not to be conceded even to the amiable sympathies of friendship; nor their just measure and degree to be accommodated to the formation of a polished and a pointed sen-

[a] Dr. *Parr*, in speaking of the state of his mind respecting the book published by this excellent man and sincere Christian, which gave rise to the strictures of Mr. *Fellowes*, says, that the description of it lies in the following narrow compass—τὰ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὐ μέμνημαι; τὰ δὲ μέσα, οὐ συνίημι; τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, οὐ δοκιμάζω.—Now although there be some opinions in Mr. *Wilberforce's* work, to which I am as unwilling to apply the δοκιμάζω as Dr. *Parr* can be; yet I cannot help thinking, that it would neither have discredited his *discernment* to have understood the reasoning, nor his taste and piety to have stored his *memory* with many of the results which it contains.—I confess, I think it but a bad symptom of the times, when even grave characters can be found to join in the vulgar ridicule of distinguished piety: when religious seriousness but serves as a ground for ludicrous denominations and sarcastic epithets; and these too not confined to the light and the malevolent, but receiving a partial sanction from the philosopher and the divine, and even admitted with more than toleration in one of the great assemblies, with whose morality and corruption those of the entire people of these nations are vitally interwoven.

tence. It were to be wished, that in his praises of Mr. F. he had not selected as a mark of his *sense*, his being "a CHRISTIAN WITHOUT BIGOTRY." It certainly, on the other hand, is not to be wondered at, that Mr. *Fellowes* has returned the compliment, by describing his eloquent encomaist, as "a PRIEST WITHOUT INTOLERANCE AND WITHOUT GUILE."—The reciprocal panegyric might surely have been rendered sufficiently palatable, without the seasoning of illiberal aspersions upon *Christianity* and its *Priesthood*.

Dr. *Parr*, for whose general character and talents I feel, in common with all who can appreciate integrity and genius, a sincere and unaffected reverence, may think that I have spoken too strongly upon this subject. But the impress of his praise is no slight matter; and the danger of its giving a circulation to what ought not (and without it perhaps would not) obtain currency with the public, demands an open exposure of the baseness of the coin, to which it would attach a fictitious value.

In truth, mischievous as are the publications of Mr. *Fellowes*, I should not have thought it necessary to animadvert upon them in this place, but that the eloquent eulogies of Dr. *Parr*, joined to the writer's presenting himself to the public as a clergyman of the Establishment, might, by throwing young readers off their guard as to the true character and object of his works, expose them to be misled by the false lights of a treacherous *Guide*. To such readers, the *satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum*, of the author, is imposing; the specious gloss of liberality and benevolence, which his writings wear, is attractive; the classic authority of his splendid panegyrist is commanding. And, as it was for readers of this description, especially for students in divinity intended for holy orders, that the present work was originally designed, it naturally falls within its province to endeavour to secure them against such snares, when calculated to entrap them into false notions of their duties as professors of a Christian faith, or of their engagements as members of a National clergy.

NO. LXXIII.—THE ATONEMENT BY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST MORE STRICTLY VICARIOUS, THAN THAT BY THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, WHEREBY IT WAS TYPIFIED.

VOL. I., page 43. (a).—The justness of the position, here laid down, will be readily perceived, not only from the observations in pp. 42, 43 of vol. i., but yet more fully from comparing what has been said in Numbers XXXVIII. and XXXIX. on the vicarious *import* of the legal sacrifices, with the remarks in Number XLII. on the true and *essentially vicarious* sacrifice of Christ. The reflections contained in pp. 230, 231. 254, 255 of vol. i. should be particularly attended to, as pointing out the due *proportion* of the Mosaic and Christian atonements. See also pp. 40, 41 of vol. i., and Number LXVIII. and pp. 475, 476, in Number LXIX.

I subjoin here a very extraordinary paragraph, which I find in a treatise of *Danzius de Λύτρῳ Redemptionis humanæ*, on the subject of an admission by the *Jews* of the vicarious suffering of the SON for the sins of men, pursuant to an eternal compact with the FATHER to that end.—"Consentiunt hic nobismet Judæi, scilicet Deum Patrem cum Filio suo jam ab æterno de redimendo humano genere consilium iniise. Hinc notabilem quendam hâc de re inter Deum et Messiam dialogum, per fabulam, fingunt: quem ex Helvico hic apponere placet, qui eundem ex *R. Mos. Haddarschan*, super Gen. i. 3. excerpsit, et ita sonat; *Dixit Jehova sanctus Benedictus, Messia juste mi! isti, qui sunt reconditi apud te, hujusmodi erunt, quod futurum, ut peccata eorum inducant te in jugum grave*, &c. *Respondit coram eo Messias, Domine mundi! Ego quidem lætus suscipio super me tribulationes istas, sive tormenta: eo tamen pacto, ut tu in diebus meis vivifices mortuos, et eos, qui a primo Adamo usque ad illud tempus mortui fuerint*, &c. *Dixit ei Sanctus Benedictus, Concedo. Protinus igitur suscepit ex dilectione super se Messias tormenta omnia et tribulationes, sicut scriptum est, Ies.* LIII. AFFLICTUS IPSE, ET ANGUSTIATUS EST."——

Meuschen. Nov. Test. ex Talm. p. 850.——This extract I give to the reader as matter of curiosity.

NO. LXXIV.—CONCLUDING NUMBER.

Vol. I., page 43. (b).—Those objections, the discussion of which would have been improper and impracticable from the pulpit, have been carefully canvassed in the preceding dissertations. It has been the wish of the Author to notice *all* that seemed in any degree deserving of attention. They, who are acquainted with the subject, will, it is hoped, do him the justice to allow, that he has omitted none of moment. Whether he has been as successful in their refutation, as he has been industrious in their collection, it is for others to judge. This at least he can venture to affirm, that he has examined them with a conscientious regard to Truth and Scripture. And he now concludes this inquiry with an humble, and not unanxious, hope, that the Word of God may not have suffered in his hands.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF

THE UNITARIAN SCHEME,

AS DESCRIBED BY MR. BELSHAM,

IN HIS REVIEW OF MR. WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE;

WITH OCCASIONAL STRICTURES

ON THE LEADING ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN THAT PUBLICATION.

"Οὕτως ἀπαλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἕτοιμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται."—*Thucyd.* lib. i. c. 20.

"I like not that arrogant theology, which presumes to explore what *angels desire to look into*, and which, failing in its attempt, rejects as absurd what it is not able to understand."—*Bishop Watson's Charge in* 1795.

"Aperte dicite non vos credere Christi Evangelio: nam qui in Evangelio quod vultis creditis, quod vultis non creditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis."—*Aug. cont. Faust.* tom. vi. p. 336, ed. 1569.

APPENDIX.

In supplement to certain remarks in the preceding sheets, (particularly to those in vol. i. pp. 8, 9. 47—59. 99—103. 112—118,) it becomes necessary to exhibit a brief outline of the opinions of that sect, which, under the assumed title of Unitarian, has presumed to arrogate the exclusive profession of the *Divine Unity;* and which has of late years exerted itself, in the Sister Country, with uncommon zeal and activity, for the subversion of the doctrines and the establishment of the National religion.

An abstract, presenting at one view the leading principles and consequences of the system, divested of the imposing phraseology which writers of modern days know so well how to apply to all objects whether worthy or unworthy, may prove not less beneficial to some who have, than to others who have not, embraced its doctrines. The task, indeed, is not without its difficulty. To seize what is fugitive; to fix that which is ever in the act of change; to chain down the Proteus to one form, and to catch his likeness ere he has shifted to another;—this is certainly a work not easy to be accomplished. What Unitarianism, however, was in the year[a] 1798, a writer, who professes himself its faithful interpreter and vindicator, has circumstantially detailed. Mr. Belsham, the late theological teacher at Hackney, has, *ex officio*, an-

[a] This Appendix was originally drawn up in the year 1800. What have been the wanderings of the fugitive since that period, the Author has had little leisure, and less inclination, to explore. He is also disposed to think, that full as much consequence has been already attached to the subject, as it is entitled to.

nounced the creed of the day: and, so far as the principle of dissent can admit concurrence, the doctrines which he has promulged may reasonably be presumed to be those generally received by the Dissenters of the Unitarian denomination throughout the Sister Country.

The scheme, as presented by this writer, in his *Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Enquiry*, is briefly as follows.—Beginning with the existence of "an infinitely powerful, wise, and good Being, as the first and fundamental principle of rational religion," he pronounces the essence of this Being to be *love:* and from this he infers, as a demonstrable consequence, that none of the creatures formed by such a being, "will ever be made eternally miserable." To suppose the contrary, he maintains, is not only inconsistent with the Divine benevolence, but directly contradictory to the plainest principles of justice. That all will rise again after death, he admits to have been taught by Christ: and he likewise admits, that "the wicked will be raised to suffering. But, since God would act *unjustly* in inflicting eternal misery for temporary crimes, the sufferings of the wicked can be but remedial, and will terminate in a complete purification from moral disorder, and in their ultimate restoration to virtue and happiness"[a]; or, as he elsewhere[b] expresses it, "Moral evil must be expelled by the application of natural evil;" and, if not fully effected in this life, "the process must be carried on by the severer sufferings of a future retribution."—Thus the doctrine of a *purgatory*[c] stands immoveably fixed on the basis of the Divine justice: and the antithesis between *eternal* misery and *temporary* crimes is made to complete the demonstration of the Unitarian; by which he is not only enabled to communicate "confidence" and "tranquillity" to the "enlightened and virtuous believer,"[d] but, he might have also added, a hardened and fearless security to the impenitent offender: and without this, he contends, "the God of nature must be viewed as frowning over his works, and, like a merciless

[a] *Review*, &c., pp. 12—16.
[b] Pp. 41, 42.
[c] See, besides the above references, p. 154.
[d] P. 21.

tyrant, dooming his helpless creatures to eternal misery," &c.[a]—Whoever desires to see this curious specimen of reasoning fully examined and exposed, will find ample satisfaction in *Mr. Walker's Letter to Mr. Belsham*, pp. 40—42.

Having thus softened down the article of judicial retribution, and lightened guilt of most of its terrors, as well as of much of its deformity, (there being, as he contends, "a preponderance of virtue, even in characters contaminated with the grossest vice;"[b]) he naturally proceeds to depreciate the value of the *atonement by Christ*.—The notion of his death, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, Mr. B. totally rejects: and the doctrine of redemption through his blood, he holds to be an entire mistake, founded in the misunderstanding of certain phrases peculiar to the Jews[c]: and finally, for the full establishment of his opinions, he refers us to Dr. J. Taylor; the amount of whose reasoning on this head, "in his *admirable*[d] *Key*," as Mr. B. thinks proper to call it, has been already examined at large, in the foregoing work, especially vol. i. pp. 118—122. 130—132. 207—215.

The merits and the sufferings of Christ having, in the scheme of this writer, no connexion with the acceptance of

[a] P. 20.

[b] Pp. 14. 38, 39, 40. 42.

[c] Pp. 17, 18. 105, 106.

[d] In a periodical publication, distinguished for the uprightness and talent with which it is conducted, there is to be found a series of valuable letters, upon the subject of the work above alluded to: and in the conclusion, the writer observes as follows, upon this "*admirable Key*."—"The key of this author is not, I am persuaded, the legitimate one. I should rather be tempted to resemble it to some of those false keys, vulgarly called picklocks.—The web of the key, to speak technically, is, in those ingenious instruments, cut to as *slender a form* as is consistent with the strength necessary for turning the bolt, in order that the chance of the impediment from the wards may be as little as possible. But the lock, with which this theological adventurer had to do, was of such a peculiar construction, as to resist every effort to open it, except with the true key. The Doctor gave some desperate wrenches, and doubtless imagined that he had effected his purpose when he found the key turn in his hand. But it has been discovered by others, that he did no more than break it in the lock, and the bolt, for any thing which he has done to remove it, remains where it was before."—*Christ. Observ.* vol. vi. p. 504.—The figure undoubtedly conveys no incorrect idea of the work which it is so much the fashion with Socinian writers, and with good reason, to extol.

man; the notion of his divine nature, and even that of his pre-existence, are discarded as wild chimeras. Jesus Christ he considers "as a man *in all respects* like to his brethren:" and he seems particularly anxious that the opinions of the Unitarian should not be confounded with those of Socinus; who, he says, whilst he properly maintains, "that Jesus had no existence before his birth, yet admits the unscriptural and most incredible notion, that, since his resurrection, he has been advanced to the government of the universe."[a] The father of Socinianism had but half accomplished the work of degrading the Son of God, whilst he allowed him a superiority over the human kind after death. Mr. B., with strict consistency, completes the system; and boldly contends, that as he differed in no respect from man in his mode of coming into the world, so can he have no dominion or superiority over him in the world of spirits. That he "is indeed now alive, and employed in offices the most honourable and benevolent," he does not attempt to deny: but since "*we are totally ignorant of the place where he resides, and of the occupations in which he is engaged*," he maintains, that "there can be no proper foundation for religious addresses to him, nor of gratitude for favours now received, nor yet of confidence in his future interposition in our behalf."[b] Thus, because we are ignorant of the *place* and *occupations* of the Son of God, is all intercourse between man and his Redeemer at an end! Thus says Mr. Belsham. And so far is he from considering our blessed Lord as an object of religious address, that he can look on him only as the "most excellent of *human* characters, the most eminent of all the prophets of God;" whose "memory he reveres," whose "doctrine he embraces," in whose "promises he confides," and to whose "authority he bows."[c]

To what then does Christianity amount, on Mr. Belsham's plan? To nothing more than good habits; and these habits, the result of man's own unaided and independent exertions,

[a] P. 74. [b] P. 85. [c] Pp. 84, 85.

or rather the result of external influences and irresistible impressions[a]. Those usually received, and (as Mr. Wilberforce properly styles them) *peculiar* doctrines of Christianity, which declare the *corrupted state of human nature*, the *atonement of the Saviour*, and the *sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit*, our author rejects as utterly inconsistent with truth and Scripture[b]. The preponderance of virtue over vice in the world at large, and with a very few, if any exceptions, in every individual in particular, he maintains to be indisputable[c]. The practice of virtue, he pronounces to be the only ground of acceptance with God, without any regard to faith in Christ, to his merits, or his sufferings, all which he proscribes as notions unscriptural and absurd[d]: and as to the influence of the Holy Spirit being that which prompts to virtue, he finds little difficulty in expunging this likewise from his creed, being fully satisfied "that the Scriptures do not teach the existence of any such person as the Holy Spirit, and that there is no ground for the expectation of any supernatural operation on the mind."[e] The sole incitements to virtuous conduct spring, according to Mr. B., from "the circumstances in which men are placed, and the impressions to which they are exposed:"—"moral and religious habits, not being acquired in any different way from other habits, of mind:"[f]—that is, according to his reasoning, all being equally the result of a *necessary* operation: the religious tendency, as well as its opposite, naturally arising out of a certain "state of the brain;"[g] and "habits growing by the influence of particular impressions with the same regularity and certainty, with which the fruits of the earth are produced and matured by the genial influence of the sun, and of the fructifying showers."[h]

Thus does the advocate of human *merit* vindicate the *in-*

[a] Pp. 170—175.
[b] P. 170.
[c] Pp. 13, 14. 38, 39.
[d] Pp. 104, 105. 172, 173.
[e] P. 97.—See also pp. 70, 71. 76, 77, 78, 79.
[f] Pp. 134. 148. 173. 180.
[g] P. 171.
[h] Pp. 174, 175; also p. 41.

dependency of human virtue. Let us stop for a moment to examine this more fully.—"Virtue[a] is a system of habits, conducing to the greatest ultimate happiness:"[b] "and men being the creatures of circumstances, the habits they form, whether good or bad, are the result of the impressions to which they are exposed;"[c]—or, as we have just seen, are the result of a *necessary* and *mechanical* operation, and arise out of causes independent of the agent, if such he can be called. Now it seems natural to demand of this writer, in what respect his scheme differs from that part of the high doctrines of Calvin, which he most strongly reprobates? Does he not equally with the reformer of Geneva contend that man has nothing which he can call his own? Does he not, equally with him, reduce every action under the necessary and irresistible control of motives, in which the agent has no choice, and over which he can have no power? And does he not,

[a] Mr. B. in his *Elements*, where it is his intention to convey his ideas in the most scientific form, defines virtue to be, "the tendency of an action, affection, habit, or character, to the ultimate happiness of the agent." (p. 371.) It is at the same time to be noted, that of this tendency the true and proper judge is the agent himself. What then follows? Why, plainly this, as Dr. Price has properly objected, that, agreeably to this definition, "any the most pernicious and horrible effects will become just and fit to be produced by any being, if but the minutest degree of clear advantage or pleasure may result to him from them." (*Review of Morals*, p. 183.) Now how does Mr. Cooper, who coincides in Mr. Belsham's sentiments, reply to this? "Granted. But *let God look to that.* A future state of retribution has been ascertained for the very purpose of obviating this objection." Mr. B. indeed admits, that "the expression is harsh, and hardly consistent with the reverence due to the Supreme Being;" but contends "that the meaning is just, and the reply satisfactory."—What! a *retribution* hereafter! Wherefore a *retribution?* Must a being, whose only business was to *calculate* the balance of advantage, suffer for a mistake in that calculation, when he made it with a view to that which alone he was bound to look to, his own advantage? And this, too, when he could not by any possibility have made a different calculation. For, as Mr. B. informs us, (*Elements*, p. 391,) "the *only* difference between the most virtuous and the most vicious person is, that the former was placed in circumstances, and exposed to impressions, which *generated* virtuous habits and affections, and the latter in circumstances by which vicious principles and dispositions were produced:" the one so circumstanced as that he *must unavoidably calculate right*, and the other so circumstanced as that he *must unavoidably calculate wrong*.—So much for the true distinction between virtue and vice.

[b] P. 38.

[c] P. 41.

whilst he thus concurs with the follower of Calvin, differ from himself, by abolishing the very idea of merit, whilst he makes merit the foundation of his system?

Mr. B., indeed, exerts all his ingenuity, as Dr. Priestley had done before[a], to escape from this resemblance to the Calvinist. The attempt, however, is vain. The Unitarian may fancy that he has provided a complete salvo for the difficulties of his system, and a clear distinction from that of the Calvinist, by substituting his notion of a *purgatory* for that of *eternal punishment*. But here, the consequences with which he presses the Calvinist return upon himself. For, if it be inconsistent with "infinite justice and goodness to doom a being to *eternal misery*, for no other cause, but that of not extricating himself out of the state in which his Creator placed him, without any power to act or will;"[b] I would ask, by what principles of reasoning it can be reconciled to the same infinite justice and goodness, to doom to *temporary misery* a being placed in circumstances precisely similar; *i. e.* determined to one certain mode of action, by an indissoluble chain of motives, and an irresistible necessity. If the idea of *punishment* for that which was the result of inevitable necessity, be repugnant to the essential nature of *justice*, it must be equally so, whether that punishment be of long or of short duration. The *quantity* of the evil endured, if no evil *whatever* ought to be inflicted, can make no change in the nature of the case. The Power that prolongs or heightens the punishment, where *no* punishment was deserved, may be more malignant, but cannot be more unjust. Thus, then, allowing to the Unitarian the full benefit of his *purgatorial*[c] scheme (for which however Scripture supplies

[a] *Philosoph. Necessity*, sect. xiii.

[b] *Review*, p. 58.

[c] The formal notion of a *purgatory* I find laid down by our author, in the *philosophical* treatise before alluded to, in which it is his professed object to give to students accurate and fundamental notions on all the leading subjects of morality and religion. That the precision of his ideas may not suffer in the reporting, I shall state them in his own words. "If there be a future life, the immediate condition of the great mass of mankind when they enter upon it must be a state of very considerable pain and suffering. For the great majority of human characters are alloyed with one or more vicious habits and

not the smallest foundation,) he is exposed, equally with the Calvinist, to the charge, which he himself brings against the latter, of "impeaching the character of his Maker, and traducing his works."[a]—Thus much for the *consequences* of the two systems.

Again, as to the *principle* of necessity, it is precisely the same, whether the Unitarian endeavour to dignify it, by the title of *philosophical;* or degrade it, by that of *predestinarian*. Or, if Mr. Belsham will still pretend to differ from the follower of Calvin, whom he describes as equally with himself pronouncing man a *necessary* instrument destitute of self-agency, it can only be in this; that whilst the latter makes man a *necessary* instrument in the hand of God, Mr. B.'s system admits the possibility of rescuing him from this slavish subjection to his Maker, by placing him under the irresistible control of *chance*, or *destiny*, or some other *equally* conceivable power. For, to suppose all the actions of man to spring necessarily from motives, and these motives the unavoidable result of external impressions and local circumstances; the divine Spirit giving no direction in the particular case, and the man having no power either to regulate their operation

affections. *These must be put under a process of cure, more or less severe in proportion to the malignity of the moral disease."—Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, p. 402. Our author also affirms that he has the testimony of Scripture for this doctrine. I apprehend it must be the *Second of Maccabees*, where *others* have pretended to find it also. Or, perhaps, as he has not joined in turning the doctrine to so good account as those who profess to have found it there, his authority has been of that classical nature which might better suit a philosopher.

"Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt: aliæ panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.
Quisque suos patimur Manes."
Æn. Lib. vi.

"For this are various penances enjoined;
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind;
Some plunged in waters, others plunged in fires,
Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.
All have their Manes, and those Manes bear." DRYDEN.

Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and *Papists,* have heretofore held these notions: to these we must now add the *Philosophical Unitarian.*

[a] *Review*, p. 37.

or to resist their impulse; is to suppose all that the Stoic and the Atheist could desire.

Such is the exalted *merit* of man, fashioned by the deistical jargon of that, which equally disgraces Christianity and philosophy, by assuming their names. Such are the lights afforded us by the *Rational* Christian: who mends Calvinism by Purgatory; secures to man a property in his actions, by rendering him the unresisting slave of motives; and maintains the interests of religion, by subjecting human conduct solely to the mechanical operations of secondary causes.

It is indeed extremely difficult to make out Mr. Belsham's system. But it is one of the advantages of inconsistency, that the statement of the absurdities in one part of an argument, is liable to be discredited by contradictory positions in another. Thus, whilst Mr. B. repeatedly affirms, that man is not to look to the influence and sustaining aid of the divine Spirit, but solely to his own exertions, or, as he most singularly explains these exertions, to circumstances and impressions which work upon his mind by a mechanical and necessary operation; he professes, in other places, not altogether to banish the notion of the divine agency. "We are," he says, "thankfully to ascribe all our improvements, our hopes, and our consolations, to God."[a] Mr. B. has here struck a little out of the path to direct Atheism, in which he seemed before rapidly advancing: and this saving clause was indispensable to a writer, who professes a belief in the existence of a God. But when we come to inquire, on what ground our gratitude is due to a Being, who has not contributed by any beneficial influence to the improvement of our virtue, we find our independence of a divine grace still carefully secured, inasmuch as the sole foundation of our thankfulness to the Supreme Being is, that "to his appointment, and continued agency, all causes owe their efficacy."[b] It is, then, for the original constitution and general arrangement of the works of nature alone that we are to be grateful; and not for any special operation of a divine influence, in any

[a] P. 175. [b] Pp. 175. 180.

individual case. May we not, therefore, fairly apply to our philosopher, what Cicero pronounced of the refiners of ancient times, "*verbis* reliquisse Deos, *re* sustulisse"?

But, that we may the more perfectly understand our author's meaning, he supplies us with a specimen of the mode in which a judicious instructor should endeavour to reclaim a vicious person, desirous of reformation. Having first carefully guarded him against all unscriptural doctrines, such as *original sin*, *atonement*, *merits of Christ*, and the like; having warned him, not to expect any supernatural impressions upon his mind, nor to imagine that moral and religious habits are to be acquired in a way different from any other; having pointed his attention, particularly, to those parts of Scripture, which direct him to *do justice*, to *love mercy*, &c.: having urged him to fix in his mind just and honourable sentiments of God, as the greatest, wisest, and best of beings[a];—he proceeds, more circumstantially, to the case of the offender; and beginning, in due form, with a *definition* of Virtue, "as a course of conduct leading to the greatest ultimate happiness," and of Vice, as "that which leads to misery;"—he next lays before the sinner, (or, in the milder vocabulary of Mr. B., the "person oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits,"[b]) the exact state of his case.—"You are deficient in virtuous habits; you wish to form them: you have contracted vicious affections; you wish[c] to exterminate them. You know the circumstances in which your vicious habits were

[a] P. 174.

[b] P. 172.

[c] N.B. It is above all things necessary for the reformation of this person "oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits," (so alarming and fanatical a phrase as that of *sinner* I must not use,) that he feel *no remorse*, be the vicious acts that he has committed ever so enormous. For Mr. Belsham informs us, in his *Elements*, (pp. 307. 406,) that "the doctrine of philosophical necessity *supersedes* remorse." And, indeed, it is happy that it does so; because, whilst, on the one hand, he pronounces remorse *not to be essential* to repentance; he proves, on the other, that it is a thing in itself *highly pernicious*; inasmuch as it is "founded upon the belief, that in the same previous circumstances it was possible to have acted otherwise."—A perfect freedom from uneasiness of mind, after the murder of a parent, or the seduction of the innocent; an undisturbed composure, flowing from the conviction that under all the circumstances it was impossible to have acted otherwise, must surely contribute much to accelerate the repentance of the offender, and to complete his reformation!

originally contracted, and by which they have been confirmed. Avoid[a] these circumstances, *and give the mind a contrary bias.* You know what impression will produce justice, benevolence, &c.—*Expose your mind repeatedly and perseveringly to the influence of these impressions,* and the affections themselves will gradually rise, and insensibly improve, &c.—*ALL that is required is judgment, resolution, time, and perseverance!*"[b]—Really, Mr. B. must excuse me, if I take the liberty of saying, that I know nothing in the English language equal to this, except the *Energies of Miss Bridgetina Botherim.*[c] It is not my intention to introduce ludicrous

[a] This is a whimsical sort of address, from a writer who, upon his principle of *necessity*, maintains the impossibility of avoiding, upon the recurrence of similar circumstances, any act which has once been performed. For if this be, as he contends it is, (*Elements*, &c., p. 107,) a sufficient reason for asserting that the person, who has once yielded to any temptation, *must* under the like circumstances yield to it again, and that, consequently, the only chance for his escape is to be found in flight; it must likewise be a sufficient reason for concluding that he, who has not at one time been able to fly from the circumstances which brought the temptation, will not be able to fly from them at another; the circumstances at the time of the intended flight being the same as before: and thus the impossibility recurs *ad infinitum.*—Our writer had condemned Mr. Godwin, (*Elements*, &c., p. 405,) for the indiscreet avowal of the consequences of this system; namely, that *necessary agents are incapable of moral discipline.* But has not Mr. B. himself, as completely disclosed the secret by his reasoning? For, if a *necessary agent* can never acquire an increase of strength, to resist the temptations of vice, where is the improvement in moral discipline? This *Parthian* moralist, who is to be for ever unequal to the σταδία ὑομίνη, and can hope to conquer only by flying, will find that he will not have much to boast of in the way of conquest, if his steed is to be as much fettered in the flight as he is himself manacled in the conflict. Alas! that Mr. B. will not permit his penitent to call to his aid that auxiliary, and that armour, which would enable him to *quench all the fiery darts of the wicked!*

[b] Pp. 174, 175.

[c] *Modern Philosophers:*—a work which, if perused with feelings favourable to religion and order, must be allowed to furnish a decisive proof that Mrs. Hannah More is not the only female, of the present day, by whom zeal and talents have been eminently displayed, in defence of all that can be deemed valuable in this life, and in that which is to come.

Were we, in truth, to search out among the authors of later times, for those who have most successfully promoted the cause of virtue and religion, by the combination of what is most interesting with what is most edifying in their writings, we should find them to have been principally of the other sex. With the name of *Mrs. Hannah More,* who ranks eminent in that class,—and whose numerous and diversified publications, scattering their benefits through every gradation of society, from the prince down to the peasant, have come home to the breasts of all with that irre-

ideas upon such a subject: but the resemblance is too striking and apposite to be overlooked.

So far as Mr. Belsham's language is intelligible, his process of conversion amounts to this:—He tells the vicious person, that he has contracted bad habits; and he desires him by all means to get rid of them. How far this salutary advice and direction would operate to the reformation of the sinner, they, who may have been reclaimed from vicious courses by such means, can best say. But one thing deserves particularly to be remarked, that, whilst the mind of the sinner is directed to contemplate the excellence of virtue, to excite its own energies, to expose itself to impressions, and the like, not one word escapes of the propriety of *prayer;* on the contrary, all supplication for divine assistance seems to be expressly excluded, and, indeed, evidently must be so, on Mr. Belsham's principles. For, if goodness be the *necessary* result of impressions and circumstances, the mechanical effect of particular traces on the brain, derived from the general operation of established and unalterable laws of our constitution, there is no room, in the particular case, for divine interference. We may, according to Mr. B.'s principles, indulge in sentiments of complacency to that first Cause, the beneficial effects of whose original arrangement we feel in the individual instance; but *prayer* addressed to the Divine Being can have no rational object. Prayer, ac-

sistible force which springs from the united powers of piety and genius,—we have to connect, in grateful remembrance, the names of *Hamilton*, of *Bowdler*, of *West*, of *Chapone*, and (notwithstanding something that one could wish to be otherwise) of *Barbauld*. To "the venerable *Elizabeth Carter* and the blooming *Elizabeth Smith*," we have also to cast our eyes; if, in Mrs. More's words, we would "contemplate profound and various learning chastised by true Christian humility;" and if we would wish to dwell on the recollection of "acquirements, which would have been distinguished in a university, meekly softened and beautifully shaded by the gentle exertion of every domestic virtue, the unaffected exercise of every feminine employment." (*Cœlebs*, pp. 250, 251.) Did my present subject lead me merely to advert to the distinction which superior talents, exquisite taste, and the charms of fine composition, confer upon the female writers of the present day, it would be impossible to overlook the commanding claims of Miss Edgeworth.

cordingly, forms no part of this writer's system. In no one line of his work does he recognise it as a Christian duty:—indeed the mention of it has not once escaped him.

It is not then surprising, that we should find Mr. B. endeavouring to diminish the opportunities and inducements to prayer by contending, that the Christian religion has not prescribed the appointment of a day for the purposes of divine worship. But he goes farther. He affirms, that "Christianity expressly abolishes every such distinction of days:"[a] that, "under the Christian dispensation, every day is alike; no one more holy than another: that whatever employment, or amusement, is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week, is equally lawful and expedient on any other day:"[b] that, consequently, "a virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him in the closet, or in the temple."[c] From these premises he peremptorily concludes, that all distinctions of days should be exploded: that our business, and our amusements, should be pursued on every day alike: and that the laws which enjoin the observance of the Sabbath are "unreasonable and unjust."[d] He likewise maintains, that the Sabbatical spirit naturally leads to uncharitable and censorious feelings[e]; that "persons who are *so very religious* on a Sunday," (as to make regular attendance on the services of the church a matter of conscience,) "are too apt to lay aside religion for the rest of the week;"[f] and that, upon the whole, the Sabbatical observance is highly injurious to the cause of Virtue. To this pernicious institution our author does not scruple to attribute the decrease of national morality: and he rejoices, with a *Christian joy*, that the late "ill advised" proposition, "for enforcing a stricter observation of the Lord's day," was wisely rejected by the Legislature[g].

[a] *Review*, p. 20. [b] Pp. 20. 139. [c] P. 133.
[d] Pp. 140, 141. [e] P. 141. [f] P. 142. [g] P. 203.

Now, it may perhaps occur to a plain, unphilosophical reader to inquire, what sort of teacher of Christianity is this, who thus levels Christ, through the *whole* of his existence, to the rank of human nature;—leaves man, for acceptance, to his own merit; and that *merit* the pure result of external impressions, and mechanical operation;—rejects the notion of prayer[a], making man as it were independent of his Maker;

[a] How different are the reflections of true philosophy, guided by a pious reverence for the superior lights of Revelation! The words of a distinguished and attractive writer, whose publications have always tended to promote, what his life has uniformly exemplified, the love and practice of virtue, are too interesting and important to be omitted on this subject.—"If we admit the truth of Revelation, the evidence which it delivers of the *special interposition of God*, in the physical and moral government of the world, must be deemed *decisive*. Instead, therefore, of involving ourselves in the mazes of metaphysical subtilty, let us direct our attention to the foundation of that intercourse with the Deity, which is at once the most interesting duty, and the noblest privilege of our nature. We are taught that *he who cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him:* that *in him we live, and move, and have our being:* that *as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him:* that *if we, being evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, how much more shall our Father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him. For this thing*, says St. Paul, *I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me:* And our Saviour is recorded to have prayed the *third time, saying the same words, O! my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.* Indeed the form of devotion, which Christ recommended to his disciples, affords the clearest proof that he regarded prayer as an acceptable and efficacious act. Nor is this supposition inconsistent with that immutability of the divine attributes, which is essential to their nature and perfection. The wisdom, benevolence, and justice of the Deity are *the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.* But this unchangeableness implies, that in their exercise they are always accommodated to the purest rectitude, and to the greatest sum of felicity. And thus a Providence is established, which discriminates between the virtuous and the vicious; which adapts the properest means to the accomplishment of the best ends; and regulates all things so as to work together for the highest good. To this superintending direction a pious Christian will look up, with humble confidence, *for ease under suffering, for protection in danger*, and *consolation in sorrow.* If prayer were not enjoined, as a duty, he would instinctively perform it as a refuge for human infirmity. And he may reasonably presume, that such filial dependence will be indulgently accepted by his heavenly Father, who in his divine administration is characterized as being ever ready *to bind up the broken in heart; to heal the wounded in spirit; and to give good gifts to them that* worthily *ask him.*" FATHER'S INSTRUCTIONS—*Part the Third*—*by Thos. Percival, M.D.* pp. 118—120. I the more willingly refer to this excellent performance, because, independent of the value of the passage here extracted, and the vein of fervent piety which pervades the entire volume, the observations which it contains on the subject of the *Divine permission of Evil*, the topics it suggests for the far-

—and, finally, proscribes the Sabbath, as *destructive of Religion and Morality?* Mr. B. being aware that such a question would naturally suggest itself, has been careful to supply the answer. He tells us, that he desires to be considered, as a "Moral teacher of Christianity."[a] And, lest we might not perfectly understand the nature of this *Moral* or *Unitarian* Christianity which he teaches, he informs us, that it is *substantially* the same with the system of Lepaux, and the Theophilanthropes of France. This is a fair and candid account of the matter. The same title, which they can produce to the denomination of Christians, Mr. B. can undoubtedly advance. Indeed, his must be allowed to be yet stronger: for, though, as he observes, their "common principle is a belief in the existence, perfection, and providence of God, and in the doctrine of a future life; and their rule of morals, love to God, and good will to men;" and thus, as he remarks, their "professed principles *comprehend the essence of the Christian religion;* yet, in not admitting the resurrection of Christ, the Theophilanthropists deprive themselves of the only solid ground on which to build the hope of a future existence."[b] Thus, we see, in one short view,

ther confirmation of the *Evidences of Christianity*, and the directions it conveys for the due regulation of the *Clerical conduct and character*, entitle it to the most serious perusal of every friend to religion and virtue.

Since the date of the first edition of this work, the revered person, spoken of in the above note, has paid the last debt of nature: and has gone to receive, in another state, the reward of the piety and virtues which distinguished him in this. — To offer any general remarks here upon the life and character of a man so estimable and so esteemed, would be little worthy of a subject whose magnitude and interest entitle it to the most ample consideration. To the memory of this venerated friend, I have already elsewhere offered an humble tribute. And happily, as preserving to society a valuable light, a complete Memoir of his life and writings has been given to the public, by his son, Dr. Edward Percival, now of Dublin.—This Memoir, prefixed to the entire collection of Dr. Percival's works, must be too well known and too justly appreciated, to render it necessary for me to enlarge upon the fidelity and ability with which it has been executed. The spirit which it breathes, and the talent which it exhibits, conspire to afford the happiest presage, that the son will prove himself, through life, not unworthy of the father, whose endowments, whose attainments, and whose excellencies, he has recorded.

[a] P. 227.

[b] P. 217.

the nature of Mr. Belsham's Unitarian scheme, and its advantage over that of the French Theophilanthropes. He not only holds, in common with them, the above-mentioned *essential principles of Christianity;* but he also maintains, in addition, that a *man* has actually risen from the dead: the admission of which *fact* into the creed of the Theophilanthropes, he candidly confesses, would have left his scheme no superiority over theirs; inasmuch as, *by laying a solid ground for their doctrine of a future life*, it would have rendered their system perfectly complete.

But, seriously, are these the doctrines of that sect, who call themselves *Unitarians*, in the sister country: or are they erroneously ascribed to them by Mr. Belsham? Indeed, if we are to judge from the applause bestowed on Mr. B.'s performance by writers of that denomination in England, we have reason to think that he has given a fair representation. Now, if he has, it surely seems unworthy of men, who exult in the open and fearless avowal of their opinions, to trifle with the name of *Christian;* and if he has not, it is full time, that they should throw back Mr. B.'s doctrines on himself, and his Theophilanthrope associates. I am most willing to admit, that no person has a right to deny to Mr. B. the appellation of a "Moral teacher." To this he is fully entitled, as having a firm belief in the existence and *general* providence of God; and as inculcating principles, that tend to beget love and gratitude to that Being, and to produce a corresponding benignity of affection to our fellow-creatures, impressing the duties of benevolence and social kindness to man, as, I make not the smallest question, he truly feels them. But, whilst thus much is freely admitted, surely Mr. B. cannot reasonably be offended if he should be denied the appellation of a "*teacher of Christianity?*" For what is Christianity? Is it any thing differing from the natural religion of the Deist? And if differing; is it in doctrines, or in precepts? Not in doctrines, according to Mr. B.; for he asserts, again and again, that it has none *peculiar*. Is it in precepts? No, says Mr. B.; for the pure and simple

scheme of the Theophilanthrope, who rejects Revelation, "comprehends the *essence* of Christianity." And has, then, Jesus Christ passed as a mute across the great stage of human affairs? And shall we denominate ourselves from Him who has taught us nothing different from what we knew before? No, says Mr. B., this is not so: by his rising from the dead, he has *proved to us the certainty of a future life.*—Is this then Christianity?—Of this, Mr. B. may be an excellent teacher: but in such Christianity, his instructions will, I trust, ever be confined to a very small number indeed.

And is Mr. B. displeased with Mr. Wilberforce, for calling this "a sort of halfway-house between orthodoxy and infidelity?" I cannot but think, that most people of plain sense and candid minds, who have not been visited by any rays of modern illumination, will rather be of opinion, that Mr. W. has erred, in not advancing this mansion a little beyond the middle point. Nor is this without countenance from Mr. B. himself, since he confesses, that "of the two he would rather approach the confines of cold and cheerless scepticism, than the burning zone of merciless orthodoxy;"[a] by which last it must be observed, he understands the principles of Christianity, as held by the Established Church; *merciless* being merely the ordinary adjunct to the character of every established priesthood.

On this subject, Mr. B. exhibits rather an unfortunate specimen of that calm and softened charity, which distinguishes and adorns the temperate region, where he rejoices to find himself placed, in a happy medium between the two abovementioned "ineligible extremes." A want of integrity, a disregard of truth, "indolence, pride, and bitter zeal against all who oppose the doctrines of the public creed," he represents as the never failing consequences of an established religion, "whether true or false;" the unvarying characteristics of "an established priesthood." Such a body, he contends, "is, in its very nature, a persecuting order." "All breathe the same fiery and intemperate spirit. Truth and

[a] P. 263.

honest inquiry they are paid to discountenance and repress."[a] "Interested priests and crafty statesmen will continue to support a religious establishment, which answers their private and political purposes, at the same time that they hold its doctrines in contempt."[b] The object, to which these observations are intended more immediately to apply, Mr. B. does not leave his reader at a loss to discover, when he plainly affirms, that the heads of *our* Establishment look to means very different from that of "a sincere faith in" their own "creeds and homilies, for the prosperity of the National Church:"[c]—and with the same liberal reference it is, that he reminds us of the saying of Cicero, "that he wondered how augur could meet augur without laughing:" and again, of that memorable exclamation of Leo, in the days of papal Rome, "How lucrative is this fable of Jesus Christ!"[d]—thus clearly intimating, what a warm supporter of his doctrines and his performance has since announced in terms a little more direct,—"it is well known, that many of our public teachers laugh in their sleeves,—and some of these sleeves, they say, are of *lawn*,—at those doctrines, which they inculcate from the pulpit, with a pretended earnestness."[e]

Nor does Mr. Belsham confine his charges to those who are the immediate superintendents of the national *religion*. Though particularly favoured with Mr. B.'s notice, they do not entirely engross it. By his observations on the institution of a national fast[f], he takes care to hold up the civil, no less than the ecclesiastical heads of the state, as objects of public contempt and execration, for their gross insincerity, and unprincipled imposition on the people. Now, if all this be of the nature of that charity, which belongs to the middle region, under whose temperate influence Mr. B. professes to enjoy philosophic repose, I rather apprehend that the inha-

[a] P. 199.
[b] Pp. 230. 233.
[c] P. 220.
[d] P. 230.
[e] *Layman's Letters to Mr. Wilberforce on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity*, p. 172.
[f] *Review*, pp. 204, 205.

bitant of this "pleasant and commodious dwelling" is as far removed from the *charity*, as he boasts to be from the *peculiar doctrines*, of *Christianity*.

It must, indeed, be confessed, that great allowance is to be made for those who have been, as it were, rocked in the very cradle of discontent; and who have been used, from infancy, to view every act of the Government, and every ordinance of the Church, with the bitterness of a discomfited and vindictive enemy. But it is strange, that whilst language of the nature here cited everywhere deforms Mr. B.'s pages, and those of his Unitarian associates, they should make the *want of charity* the principal charge against all who hold Christianity in any other, than the vague, and fleeting form, in which they profess to embrace it. In the management of a controversy, it may not indeed be bad policy to charge the adversary with whatever unfair arts you mean to resort to yourself. Thus, whilst the opposite party bears all the odium, you possess yourself of the profit. So, at least, it seems to be with the writers of Mr. B.'s way of thinking. A total want of candour and charity is perpetually objected to all who defend the rectitude of the National religion; whilst every principle of both is grossly violated, by those who oppose it:—and at the same time that the charge of self-interest is freely bestowed upon such as support the Establishment; it is hoped that it will not be remembered that interest is as much concerned to acquire, as to retain; it is modestly expected that no mention will be made of the pride and fervour of party; and that no note will be taken of the resentful jealousy of those temporal advantages, which, as they form the leading theme of animadversion, may not unreasonably be presumed to be the principal ground of hostility.

In a spirit congenial to these feelings, Mr. B. seems not a little to have participated, when he thus openly states, as in another place[a] he indirectly insinuates, under the thin covering of the terms paganism and popery, that the religion of

[a] P. 196.

the Church of England is a mere engine of state; and as such "cried up by interested statesmen and their hireling priests;" who, he says again, naturally "support that religion which supports them:"[a] and that, at this moment, "*pure Christianity*" (by which he describes the system taught by himself and Dr. Priestley) "is so far from meeting with public encouragement in England, that it is in a state bordering upon persecution."[b] This last remark indeed seems, according to Mr. B.'s view of things, to have been altogether unnecessary. The assertion, that "an established priesthood is in its very nature a persecuting order," renders this a tautologous position. But, in what way do these professors of *pure Christianity* appear to be "in a state bordering upon persecution?" Simply, because they are not permitted to rail against established authority with impunity; to preach up doctrines in *politics*, subversive of subordination; to bring the government, both in church and state, into disrepute and contempt amongst the people, by every species of calumny; to establish the enlightened system of France, the Theophilanthropism of Lepaux, and the miso-monarchism of Paine. The government, the clergy, and the people of England, are surely much to blame for throwing any obstacles in the way of such great reforms!

And what is the grand proof, adduced by Mr. B. of the persecution carried on against *pure Christianity*, in England, at the present day? Plainly this, that the great champion of Unitarianism has been driven from his native country, and "compelled to seek for refuge" from the rage of persecuting bigotry "in the transatlantic wilderness;"—in which, however, it appears that he is subject to no deprivations; since we are informed in the very next line, that, in this *wilderness*, he has the good fortune to be surrounded by "enlightened sages."[c] But, ludicrous as is this picture of the *wilderness of sages*, here presented by our author, it were unfeeling, and unpardonable, to trifle on such a subject. What Dr. Priestley's reasons may have been for exchanging England

[a] P. 233. [b] P. 197. [c] Pp. 197, 198.

for America, I shall not presume to pronounce. That they are not to be resolved "*solely*" into his *religious* opinions, as Mr. B. seems desirous to convey, is, I believe, pretty generally understood. That the purity of Dr. P.'s private character, the amiable simplicity of his manners, the variety and strength of his talents, the persevering industry with which he pursued what he deemed useful truth, and the independent spirit with which (had it not been frenzied by the intemperance of party) he might have so profitably maintained it,—are circumstances, which must make every good man regret that misapplication of his powers, which rendered it necessary for him to abandon his native country in the decline of life, I will most readily admit; and I freely subscribe to the strongest testimony which his warmest admirers can bear to the many and great virtues[a] which adorn his

[a] From a friend, of the highest literary distinction and moral worth, who was connected by habits of early and continued intimacy with Dr. Priestley, I received, on the first publication of these remarks on that author's character, a letter containing the following observations.

"The character you give of Dr. Priestley has reminded me of that drawn by Dr. Samuel Parr, in his letter from Irenopolis to the inhabitants of Eleutheropolis. As this pamphlet was a temporary publication during the riots of Birmingham, and you have probably never seen it, I will transcribe the passage to which I refer.—'I confess, with sorrow, that, in too many instances, such modes of defence have been used against this formidable Heresiarch, as would hardly be justifiable in the support of Revelation itself, against the arrogance of a Bolingbroke, the buffoonery of a Mandeville, and the levity of a Voltaire. But the cause of orthodoxy requires not such aids. The Church of England approves them not. The spirit of Christianity warrants them not. Let Dr. Priestley be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation; because they present even to common observers the innocence of a hermit and the simplicity of a patriarch; and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them, the deep-fixed root of a virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit.' This beautiful portrait is, I think, accurate in its lineaments. But there are two features in the character of Dr. Priestley, which it does not exhibit, and which to you I will not scruple to communicate. He has a sort of *moral apathy*, which makes him absolutely insensible of the severity of the wounds he inflicts in his polemic discussions. Feeling no enmities in his constitution, he makes no discrimination between friends and foes. And having adopted the language and dipped

private life. But, whilst I most cheerfully make these concessions to the talents and the virtues of Dr. Priestley, and whilst I join in the most decided reprobation of those savage acts of violence, which in his instance have disgraced the annals of English polity, yet I cannot hesitate to believe that if, in any country in which the direction of affairs was held by those enlightened politicians, and professors of *pure Christianity*, who form the associates of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, any man had employed himself, for a series of years, in labouring to overturn the established order of things, and had even advanced so far, as, in the intoxication of his fancied success, openly to boast that he had prepared a train whereby the whole must inevitably be destroyed[a], a very

his pen in the gall of controversy, he suspects not that he excites bitterness of heart, because he is unconscious of it in himself. I could exemplify this observation, by his treatment of Dr. Enfield, Dr. Brocklesby, Judge Blackstone, and several others whom he really loved or respected. Another striking trait in his character, is an almost total deficiency in *discretion*, that intellectual faculty, which is, as Pope well expresses it, 'although no science, fairly worth the seven.'— A report has prevailed here, that Dr. Priestley proposes to return to England. But I find that his latest letters signify his intention of passing the remainder of his life in America, where he is happy in every respect, except the enjoyment of literary society, and possesses a library and philosophical apparatus far superior to those which he had at Birmingham."

This fragment, containing so much that is interesting concerning Dr. Priestley, will, I conceive, not be unacceptable to the reader; and although I consider the bright parts of the character to have been too highly emblazoned by Dr. Parr, the darker spots to have been too sparingly touched by my much valued correspondent, and some important points to have been entirely overlooked by both, yet I cannot withhold from the memory of a man certainly possessed of many amiable qualities, and some extraordinary endowments, a tribute, to which two persons, eminent for their worth and their attainments, have conceived him to be justly entitled.

[a] "We are, as it were, laying gunpowder, grain by grain, under the old building of error and superstition, which a single spark may hereafter inflame, so as to produce an instantaneous explosion."— *Importance of Free Inquiry*, p. 40. What Dr. P. means by the *old building of error and superstition*, the context sufficiently explains. On the impossibility of supporting the ecclesiastical constitution, if once a great majority of the people can be made hostile to it; and on "the power of small changes in the political state of things, to overturn the best-compacted establishments," he likewise enlarges with much earnestness and force: ibid. pp. 39. 41. 44. The fittest seasons, and best opportunities, for *silently* working out the great effects, which he here professes to hold in view, this writer had before communicated to his fellow-labourer Mr. Lindsey, in the dedication of his *History of Corruptions*, pp. 6, 7.—"While the attention of men in power is engrossed by the difficulties that more immediately press upon them,

different lot from that which has fallen to Dr. Priestley would await him. The privilege of transferring his residence to another land, unless indeed it were to that land from which no traveller returns, would hardly be conceded. Our enlightened philosophers, of the present day, adopt on these occasions much simpler modes of proceeding; and a peep across the British Channel may readily satisfy us as to the nature of the process, where there is *no* "lucrative fable of Jesus Christ" to be maintained; *no* "established [a] clergy to breathe the fiery spirit of persecution;" and where the rights of civil and religious man are explained and exercised upon the broadest principles of a philosophy, untrammelled, even to Mr. B.'s most sanguine wishes.

One distinction between the two cases may, indeed, possibly exist. The professors of an all-perfect philosophy and a rational Christianity *knowing* theirs to be the cause of virtue, and acting only from a love of truth, are meritorious in removing, by *whatever* means, all impediments to the accomplishment of ends so glorious, as those *they* hold in view: whereas the advocates of received doctrines, and of existing establishments, not even believing what they profess, and being only concerned to defend a lucrative falsehood, are, by the original sin of their cause, criminal in the performance of every act, however natural and necessary, which has a tendency to maintain it. This distinction may, possibly, supply a satisfactory explanation:—but to proceed.

the endeavours of the friends of reformation, in points of doctrine, pass with *less notice*, and operate *without obstruction*." Times of public danger and difficulty are thus pointed out, as best suited to lay that train, which was finally to explode with the ruin of the establishment. And, indeed, at an earlier period of life, he had even ventured to promise himself a more rapid accomplishment of the great object of his wishes. Speaking of the Establishment, and those abuses which he ascribes to the principles of the hierarchy, he does not scruple to predict, that in "some general convulsion of the state, some bold hand, secretly impelled by a vengeful Providence, shall sweep down the whole together."— *View of the Principles and Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters*, p. 12. — Passages conveying similar sentiments in the writings of Dr. Priestley might be accumulated: but their notoriety renders is unnecessary.

[a] It will be recollected that this was written in the year 1800.

As I cannot entirely agree with Mr. Belsham respecting the persecution carried on by the Established clergy against those, who, under the title of Unitarians, are, as Mr. B. affirms, the only professors of a *pure* Christianity; so neither do I agree with him respecting that, which he deems a natural consequence of this persecution,—the great increase of this body in numbers and consequence. Possibly, indeed, without making any very valuable concession to Mr. B., it might be admitted, that "the number of *Rational* Christians," (by which he means *Unitarians*, or the professors of his *Moral Christianity*,) "was never so great as at present:"[a]—a position, which, at the same time, but badly accords with the assertion, that the early Christian church was almost exclusively Unitarian. But, that "it is still a progressive cause," can by no means be allowed. So that Mr. B. may safely release his mind from all apprehensions of that, which he so sincerely deprecates, "the *support* of civil authority;" from which he seems to dread the only impediment to its triumphant progress.

If, indeed, by "progressive cause," be meant a progression in its course to that, which seems its natural termination, Deism; it might, undoubtedly, in that sense be admitted to be progressive. But if thereby be meant, a continued increase of numbers, nothing can be more opposite to the real state of the case. For let any candid and reflecting man, even of this very denomination, lay his hand upon his heart, and say what he thinks likely to be the case of the rising generation, educated in the Unitarian principles: let him say, what *has* been the case of those educated in *the straitest principles of the sect*, under the immediate instruction of its greatest luminaries, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, at the Academy of Hackney. Let Mr. B. himself say, what has been the progressive nature of the cause in that seminary. Mr. B. has too great a regard for truth, not to admit, that the pupils of the new light had gone beyond their teachers a

[a] *Review*, p. 198.

little too far; that they had somewhat too strongly [a] exemplified the progressive nature of the system, by reaching at

[a] Mr. Belsham himself, in speaking of this subject, is obliged in a great measure to acknowledge the truth of this charge. "This fact," (he says, alluding to a statement similar to the above made by Mr. Carpenter,) "to a certain extent, cannot be denied; and, most surely, it excited unpleasing sensations in many, and not least in the minds of those whose endeavours to form them to usefulness in the Church were thus painfully disappointed."—However, immediately after, he seems, in the contrast between the systems pursued at Hackney and in other seminaries where education is conducted on a different principle, to change the tone of lamentation on this head into a note of triumph. "It is an easy thing," he remarks, "for tutors to educate their pupils in the trammels of any religious faith which they may choose. Take away the key of knowledge, and the business is done. You bring them out at once Calvinists, Arians, Papists, Protestants, any thing that you please; and ready to join in the cry against any sect, which, for the season, may be obnoxious to the ruling party. This was not the method pursued at Hackney: they gloried in encouraging freedom of inquiry: nor were they at all apprehensive, that the interests of truth and virtue would suffer by it in the end." (*Letters on Arianism*, p. 40.)—Thus, Mr. Belsham, on second thoughts, is of opinion, that what was done in Hackney, is a thing to be gloried in: and that in educating those who were designed for the Christian ministry, so as to render them Infidels and Atheists, "the interests of truth and virtue cannot suffer in the end."

But, that we may the better form a right judgment of that which is conceived to constitute the excellence of those dissenting academies, to which such friends of rational inquiry as Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley have been used to look for the real improvement of youth, I here give an extract from Dr. Priestley's Memoirs relative to this subject.—"In my time, the academy was in a state *peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth, as the students were about equally divided upon every question of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, and all the articles of theological orthodoxy and heresy;* in consequence of which, *all these topics* were the *subjects of continual discussion.* Our tutors were of different opinions: Dr. Ashworth taking the orthodox side; Mr. Clarke, the sub-tutor, that of heresy, though always with the greatest modesty."——Here is a view of the true way, in which, under the guidance of the new lights of philosophy and religion, youth is to be led on "inter sylvas Academi quærere verum." The calm and undisturbed retirement of study exchanged for the unceasing wrangling of a debating club. Tutor and sub-tutor, master and pupil, all together by the ears, continually, on the gravest and deepest subjects of theological controversy; and the sublimest truths and most awful mysteries of revelation bandied about amongst boys, as the common and hourly topics of disputation: whilst the parties of combatants on every subject are equally matched, and falsehood and truth, infidelity and religion, maintained by equal numbers. Under such circumstances of education, it has been truly remarked in reference to Dr. Priestley, that in the course which, by his own account, he steered in his theological opinions, there is nothing to excite surprise. "A Calvinist at twelve; becoming an Arminian at eighteen; at twenty-one an Arian; at twenty-four a denier of his Saviour, and a disbeliever in the inspiration of the Scriptures.—Miserable infatuation! (it is justly added) to set the stripling on a sea, of which he knows neither the soundings nor the

once the goal of *Deism*, and that in some instances, perhaps not a few, the race had been crowned with the prize of direct, avowed, and unqualified ATHEISM.

Mr. Belsham affirms, that "Mr. Wilberforce and others who agree with him seldom regard their system in a comprehensive view, or pursue their principles to their just and necessary consequences:"[a] and he adds, that "it is from the absurd and injurious consequences which necessarily result from Mr. W.'s principles, that he infers their falsehood and impiety."[b] No words can more aptly convey my ideas of Mr. B.'s scheme, than those with which he has here supplied me: for, strange as this gentleman and those who think with him may affect to consider the charge, they by no means follow up their principles to their just and necessary consequences; nor, whilst they boast in a loud and exulting tone of their dauntless pursuit after truth, have they always the courage to be consistent throughout, and to advance boldly in the face of those conclusions, which to any intelligent and unprejudiced mind could not fail to evince "the falsehood and impiety" of the system. But Mr. B. himself has well remarked, that "the natural and necessary consequences of principles are the same, whether the advocates of such principles are apprized of them or not, and whether they do or do not choose to contemplate and avow them:"[c] and fact

shore; and calmly to see him rush to every point of the compass, before he knows the bearings of any!"

But this Academy, which was "in a state so peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth," was distinguished by other circumstances enumerated by Dr. Priestley, which were perhaps not less favourable to that end, than those which have been already named. "There was no provision for teaching the learned languages. We had even no compositions, or orations, in Latin. Our course of lectures was also defective, in containing no lectures on the Scriptures or on ecclesiastical history; and by the students in general, (and Mr. Alexander and myself were no exceptions,) commentators in general, and ecclesiastical history also, were *held in contempt.*"—(*Memoirs of Dr. Priestley*, p. 21.)—Thus, all the prejudices of ancient learning, which might have acted as so many clogs upon the youthful genius, were completely removed: and nothing hindered the boy of the academy from fancying himself at once arrived at that goal, which, in the more measured walks of science, the matured student feels many laborious efforts still requisite to attain.

[a] P. 10.
[b] P. 11.
[c] Ibid.

completely proves, what reason would obviously suggest, that, where the principles of this new sect have been fairly and honestly followed on to their legitimate consequences, the system of revelation, and in many cases of theism, has been entirely thrown up as a heap of mummery and priest-craft. To cite particular instances were invidious; but they are numerous, and could easily be adduced.

By what has been said it is, however, far from my intention to charge either Dr. Priestley or Mr. Belsham with a disingenuous attempt to escape from such consequences as naturally flow from the opinions which they maintain. No, I believe them both to be incapable of duplicity. But, originally educated, as both confess to have been, in the strictest tenets of that creed whose distinguishing doctrines they now reject, and having at an early age entertained a full conviction of the truth and importance of the Christian scheme, some latent influence of their first persuasion naturally remaining, they cannot now release themselves entirely from a Christian belief. Strangely as they have altered and disfigured the structure, the foundation still remains. The first impressions of the youthful mind are not easily effaced. And fortunately for these gentlemen, something of "what the nurse and priest have taught" still continues, in spite of their boast to the contrary, to retain a secret hold upon their thoughts. To have a fair experiment of the system, we must look to its effects upon those, who have never known Christianity but in the Unitarian dress of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley. Examine these, and behold its genuine fruits.

How then can we admit the truth of Mr. B.'s assertion, that the numbers of this sect daily [a] increase? In one way,

[a] The writer of a judicious paper in a late periodical publication makes the following observations on the nature of the Unitarian or Socinian sect, and on the unlikelihood of its extension:—"Socinianism must ever from its nature be the most harmless of all heresies, the least contagious of all the varieties of human opinion. It has been called, and how aptly the history of its Hackney Academy and all its other institutions may prove, the half-way house to infidelity: but it should be remembered, that many who set out on the pilgrim's-progress of inquiry, take up their place of rest there, who, if there were no such inn upon the road, would infallibly proceed to Doubting Castle. It is a sys-

indeed, but in that way only, can it bear any resemblance to fact. Men, who, having rejected the Christian revelation, are yet restrained, by a regard to opinion and decorum, from openly abdicating the Christian name, may find it not inconvenient to rank themselves of a class, whose latitude of opinion can occasion but little embarrassment to that freedom for which they contend: and thus Mr. B. may possibly reckon among the residents of his "mansion," many who are content to sojourn there, on account of its commodious neighbourhood to that region, which they regard as their true and proper home.

One proof, however, Mr. B. produces of his assertion, which might not have occurred to many, and which is entitled to a more than ordinary degree of attention; namely, that "there are thousands" of those professing themselves of the Established Church, who think with him, "but are deterred by secular considerations, and the harsh spirit of the times, from avowing their real principles."[a] Indeed, according to the charitable notions entertained by Mr. B. in common with Dr. Priestley[b], of the character of those who main-

tem which saves men from utter unbelief more frequently than it tempts them to it; and it never can become a popular doctrine. It appeals to the vanity of the half-learned, and the pride of the half-reasoning: but it neither interests the imagination, nor awakens the feelings, nor excites the passions, nor satisfies the wants of the human heart. Hence it must ever be confined to a few scanty congregations composed wholly of the reading class, and is equally incapable of producing either extensive good or extensive evil." — *Quarterly Review*, vol. iv. p. 485. With this writer I entirely agree in the opinion, that this jejune and cheerless heresy is not likely to be embraced by many: but that, so far as its influence does extend, it will be found productive of great evil without any countervailing good, is, I think, as evident, as that such an effect must follow from a dereliction of all the leading tenets of a Christian's belief: nor, I confess, does it appear to me a matter of much consequence, whether the traveller, of whom the Reviewer speaks, proceeds on his entire journey, or stops short at the inn which Unitarianism provides for him on the way.

[a] P. 227.

[b] Mr. Belsham's liberal views of the character of the clergy of the Established Church have been already noticed in this Appendix, pp. 45, 46. Dr. Priestley's representations are of a nature equally complimentary. In his *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 147, he says of the Trinitarians of the present age, that "they are all reducible to two classes, viz. that of those who, if they were ingenuous, would rank with Socinians, believing that there is no proper divinity in Christ besides that of the Father; or else with Tritheists, holding three equal and distinct Gods." Having

tain the National Faith, it is not surprising, that this should appear, to minds so prepared, with all the circumstances of probability. And certainly no argument can be more convenient: from no combination of events can its force suffer any diminution, and from no ingenuity of reply can it ever meet refutation. Though the entire host of those professing the *pure* Christianity of the Unitarian were ostensibly reduced to Dr. P. and himself, yet by the application of this argument, aided by a portion of that faith, which, not having been largely expended on other subjects, Mr. B. might have to bestow in abundance on this and similar occasions, I should not be surprised to find him solacing himself even then with the satisfactory persuasion, that the "glorious period" was fast approaching, in which "the Unitarian church" was about to "comprehend, in its ample enclosure, the whole Christianized world;"[a] the prejudices and interests of mankind causing but a temporary and artificial suppression of those sentiments, which must necessarily and universally prevail. This argument, then, I must admit to be wholly unanswerable.

Dr. Priestley has indeed advanced, that he "never knew a single instance of any person, who was once well grounded in Unitarian principles, becoming an unbeliever."[b] If the becoming an unbeliever be admitted as the proper proof of an antecedent deficiency of confirmation in Unitarian principles, the position is a safe one. But if Dr. P. means to

thus distributed the whole body of professed Trinitarians between *Insincerity* and *Ignorance*, he afterwards, in the conclusion of the same work, (vol. ii. p. 471,) narrows his attention to the clerical part of that body, pronouncing their arguments in defence of the system they support, to be "so palpably weak, that it is *barely possible* they should be in earnest:" by which it is not difficult to discover, to which of the two classes before named the Established clergy were in his opinion to be consigned.—That Dr. Priestley should, indeed, have imagined, that many, who rejected the doctrines of the Established Church, might yet be found among the ranks of its professed teachers, may well be supposed, when we recollect, that he deliberately advised Mr. Lindsey to retain his preferments in the Church, at the same time that he laboured to undermine its creed: an advice, however, which the Rector of Catterick was too honest to comply with, although it might not be unpalatable to certain clergymen of the present day; such as Mr. Fellowes and Mr. Stone.

[a] *Review*, p. 266.

[b] *Theol. Repos.* vol. iv. p. 24.

say, that the influence of Unitarian principles is unfavourable to infidelity, it need only to be replied, that the fact speaks a language directly the reverse. For it is notorious, and it will require no small degree of hardihood to deny it, that from those who have *professed* Unitarianism in England the largest stock of unbelievers has arisen: nay more, that their principal Academy, the place in which Unitarian principles were inculcated in their greatest purity, and with every advantage of zealous ability in the teacher, and of unbiassed docility in the learner, has borne witness to the efficacy of those principles, by its dissolution, imperiously demanded by the prevalence of Infidel opinions. Now in what way shall we account for this event? Was Unitarianism not properly taught at Hackney? Or, with all its vaunted simplicity, is it a scheme so difficult to conceive, that the learners, not being able to comprehend it rightly [a], became unbelievers from not having been *firmly grounded?* Howsoever it be explained, the fact is incontrovertible, and seems not a little to countenance the idea, that the road to Unitarianism differs from that which leads to Infidelity by so slight a distinction, that the traveller not unfrequently mistakes his way. And surely, if, with Mr. Wilberforce, we suppose the station of the former to be placed at no great distance from the confines of the latter, it is not surprising that they, who in the morning of life begin their journey from this advanced stage, should be able to finish the entire course with ease; whilst those, who do not reach it till the evening of their days, may have some indisposition to proceed, especially if, from early habits, they had been taught to feel a salutary horror of those regions that lie beyond.

One difficulty, amounting to paradox, which attaches to this entire system, yet remains to be noticed. It might appear to such as have been used to consider Christianity as

[a] Indeed, Mr. B. seems to represent Unitarianism as a matter complicated, and difficult to be understood. For the total rejection of Christianity by some of his Unitarian brethren, he assigns the following reasons:—"They either did not *understand their principles;* or they were *perplexed with difficulties,* which *perhaps* patience and attention might have solved; or," &c.—*Review*, p. 265.

something more than natural religion with a superadded proof of a future state of retribution, that they who hold this to be the sum of the Christian scheme must, at the same time, reject the writings of the New Testament, or at least all those parts that go beyond the mere facts, of the life and resurrection of Christ. Mr. B., however, informs us in what manner the Unitarians, whilst they retain the title of Christians by acknowledging the authority of the New Testament, yet contrive to preserve their "simple creed," unaffected by those important truths which it contains. There are two ways in which the word of Revelation and a system of religious belief may be made to square. One is, by conforming our belief to Revelation: the other, by adjusting Revelation to our belief. The latter is that chosen by Mr. B. and his Unitarian associates; and, accordingly, the New Testament, and the creed of the Unitarian, are, at the same time, without difficulty retained.

Of the mode of adjustment Mr. B. exhibits a perfect specimen. "Christ," he says, "being described in the New Testament as a man, having appeared as a man, having called himself a man,—having had all the accidents of a man; having been born, having lived, eaten, drunk, slept, conversed, rejoiced, wept, suffered, and died, as other men," there is sufficient reason to pronounce him really such; no farther proof can be required: and the *onus probandi*, he contends, lies with them, who "maintain that he was something more than man:" and whatever texts of Scripture can be adduced in support of that opinion, he adds, "the Unitarians pledge themselves to show, that they are *all* either *interpolated*, *corrupted*, or *misunderstood*:"[a] in short, they engage to get clearly rid of them in some way or other. Either the passage should have no place in Scripture; or, if it must be admitted, it should appear under some different modification; or, if the present reading must be allowed, it is wrongly interpreted by all but Unitarians; and sometimes even the subject originally misunderstood by the inspired

[a] *Review*, pp. 270, 271, 272.

writer himself: until, at length, the Sacred Volume is completely discharged of all that exceeds the convenient, portable creed of the Unitarian. This, it will be allowed, is, in Mr. B.'s own words, "*making* Scripture with a witness;"[a] and exhibits no mean specimen of my Lord Peter's ingenious device, in extracting the legitimate meaning of his father's will: the "totidem syllabis," or at all events the "totidem literis," cannot fail to supply the deficiencies of the "totidem verbis."[b]

Lest, however, these ingenious modes of eliciting the sense of Scripture should be deemed too bold, Mr. B. supplies a decisive reason to prove, that the Unitarian alone is duly qualified to form a sound judgment in matters of sacred criticism. To comprehend the true import of Scripture, he informs us, "requires time, labour, patience, and candour."[c] How then could it be expected, that any but the aforesaid moral teachers of Christianity should rightly ascertain its meaning? That this laborious, patient, and candid expurgation of Scripture, whereby every passage intimating the divine nature of Christ is completely expunged, or new modelled so as to speak a different language, shall be stigmatized by the harsh representation, of "mangling and altering the translation to the mind" of the Unitarian, as Mr. Fuller and Mr. Wilberforce have, it seems, very uncivilly described it, only serves to recall to Mr. Belsham's "recollection the honest quaker's exclamation, O argument! O argument! the Lord rebuke thee:"[d] the *argument* being,

[a] *Review*, p. 116.

[b] Tale of a Tub, sect. ii.

[c] *Review*, p. 272.

[d] This animated and delicate species of irony is, with Mr. Belsham, a favourite mode of treating his literary antagonists. Having, in his controversy with Mr. Carpenter, established the inconsistency of man's freedom with the divine foreknowledge, on such principles, that, as he modestly affirms, "*no proposition in Euclid admits of a more perfect demonstration;*" he suddenly recollects himself, — "But all this is metaphysical reasoning; and why should we puzzle ourselves with metaphysical subtilties?" And then in a spirit of humanity, sympathizing most tenderly with his galled and lacerated opponent, he exclaims,—"*O naughty metaphysics!* thus cruelly to impale a *worthy well-meaning gentleman*, upon the horns of a goring dilemma, and to leave him writhing and smarting there without relief.—I am sorry for my friend's unfortunate situation." (*Lett. on Arian.*

without question, all on the side of the Unitarian, whose modifications of the Gospel, exhibiting it as a mere revival and

p. 47.) And so he goes on grieving for the cruel discomfiture which he had himself caused to *his friend;* but which, it seems, he could not well have avoided, from the uncommon keenness of his argumentative talent, and the piercing potency of his metaphysics.—It should however be observed, to the credit of Mr. Belsham, that he has not been influenced by any unworthy fear, to withhold from the world, the knowledge of the nature and use of those all-subduing weapons, which have never failed to secure to him such easy triumphs in his controversial campaigns. The Logic and Metaphysics, whereby he has laid many a sturdy combatant low, he has fairly given to the public; and it is now the fault of those, with whom he has henceforward to contend, if they do not conceive with the same clearness, and reason with the same precision, as himself.

On the work which exhibits these, and which, dignified with the title of *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind and of Moral Philosophy*, professes to give, within the compass of one octavo volume, a most complete view of logics, morals, and metaphysics, I have had occasion already to offer some remarks, in the preceding notes of this Appendix. Those remarks, however, as they relate, for the most part, to detached topics, rather incidental to the main object of the work than essentially connected with it, scarcely supply an adequate idea of its true value, and of the benefits which must have accrued, in point of strict reasoning and just conceptions, to the students of Hackney, and which are now held out by this publication to the world at large. I shall here adduce a few specimens, which go more immediately to its general excellence as a treatise of logical and metaphysical instruction. First, in the list of *axioms* we find the following, which may prove the degree of caution with which our author proceeds. — "Axiom 4. The *agreement* of two ideas with a third, *cannot prove* their *disagreement* with each other." (p. lii.)—By this, such reasoners as are naturally led to conclude, that when two ideas agree with a third, they *must disagree* with each other, are completely guarded against falling into this vulgar error. Again, in the next page, we are apprized of a *term*, so circumstanced, as that it may become a *proposition;* namely, the major term in a Syllogism, whose major premiss is a particular affirmative. For of such a term he says, "If it be the subject, it is particularly taken *as being a particular proposition;*" and again, "If it be the predicate, it is particularly taken *as being an affirmative proposition.*" This will provide against the errors of those, who might have conceived that the term would still remain a *term*, and could never have turned into a *proposition* of any sort. Again, in the matter of *Definition*, we find much more of copiousness and versatility than can be met with in ordinary treatises of logics and metaphysics. The definitions with which the work commences, are those of *Perception*, and *Sensation*. These and their concomitants we find thus variously propounded.

1. "*Perception* is the attention, which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it by external objects or by internal feelings."
2. "*Perception* is the faculty by which we acquire sensations and ideas."
3. "*Sensation* is the perception of an object by the organs of sense."
4. "*Sensation* is the faculty of acquiring certain internal feelings, by the impression of external objects upon the organs of sense."
5. "*A Sensation* is the impression made upon the mind by an object actually present."

confirmation of natural religion, cannot fail to approve themselves to all "men of enlightened minds;" whilst the old

6. "*Sensations* are internal feelings, excited by the impressions of external objects upon the organs of sense." See pp. vii. 10, 11. 15, 16.

Now, not only have we here a rich variety of definitions, but such as, by a due combination of their powers, is found capable of engendering more. Thus, if we combine the second and fifth, we obtain a new definition for *Perception;* namely, "the faculty by which we acquire *impressions* made upon the mind," &c.: so that *Perception* finally turns out to be its own producer, inasmuch as it seeks after and acquires those impressions, from which, we are told in the first definition, it derives its existence. Again, if we combine the first and sixth, we obtain a more extensive and detailed view of the nature of *Perception:* for since, in the latter, *Sensations* are described as a species of "*internal feelings,*" it follows, that "*Perception* is the attention which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it, 1. by external objects, 2. by *Sensations*, 3. by all other internal feelings." And, lastly, since by the fifth definition, "a Sensation is an impression made upon the mind," if we join this in friendly union with the two former, we have then contained in the definition of *Perception*, "an attention to impressions made upon the mind, by impressions which *are* made upon the mind." I will follow this no farther. I do not pretend to exhaust the combinations and their results: these few perhaps may satisfy the reader.

Of our author's uncommon powers in *definition*, I shall only give one instance more: but that one cannot but be deemed sufficient, inasmuch as it will show the possibility of deciding, in an instant, the most difficult questions in metaphysics. "VOLITION is that state of mind, which is immediately *previous* to actions which are called voluntary."—"NATURAL LIBERTY, or, as it is more properly called, PHILOSOPHICAL LIBERTY, is the power of doing an action, or its contrary, *all the previous circumstances* remaining the same." (p. 227.) Now here is the point of free-will at once decided: for, *volition* itself being included among the *previous circumstances*, it is a manifest contradiction in terms, to suppose "the power of doing an action or its contrary, all the previous circumstances remaining the same;" since that supposes the power of acting *voluntarily against a volition*. After this, surely, Mr. Belsham might have spared himself the trouble of the ninety-two pages which follow, as his opponents must have been at once suffocated by the above definitions. But the philosopher was determined to give the absurd advocate for free-will no quarter; and therefore has dealt out argument after argument, blow after blow, until the adversary is no longer able to stand before him. He was not even content, until he brought the evidence of *mathematics* to his aid, to prove, *ex absurdo*, that philosophical liberty totally confounds the distinction between virtue and vice. Thus, "for example, *benevolence without liberty* is no virtue; *malignity without liberty* is no vice. Both are equally in a neutral state. *Add a portion of liberty to both;* benevolence instantly becomes an eminent virtue, and malignity an odious vice. That is, IF TO EQUALS YOU ADD EQUALS THE WHOLES WILL BE UNEQUAL; than which nothing can be more absurd!" Does the reader doubt that these words are fairly quoted? Let him turn to pp. 258, 259 of the treatise, and satisfy himself that there is in the world such a mathematician as the author of the above proof. But I have done with this work. It must by this time be clear, that in *logics, metaphysics, morals*, and *mathematics*, the students must

orthodox fancies—that "the corruption of human nature, the atonement of the Saviour, and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit," are the prominent doctrines of the Christian Revelation,—are left to the professors of the National Faith; interested and unprincipled men, who, not believing the doctrines they uphold, "testify their regard to the Scriptures by empty professions;" or ignorant and blundering bigots, who are led by a slavish and "blind submission to vulgar interpretations."[a] It needs scarcely to be remarked, that, among the virtues of the new system, *modesty* seems not to occupy, any more than *charity*, a very distinguished place.

have been well instructed at Hackney.

Having been led by the subject of this note to the mention of a combination of metaphysical and mathematical reasoning almost too ludicrous for serious observation, I cannot make better amends to the reader for such a demand upon his patience, than by directing his attention to a very small but valuable tract, entitled, *The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity briefly invalidated;* in which the author, *Mr. Dawson of Sedbergh*, has most happily effected that which has been here so unmeaningly caricatured: having enlisted the accuracy and brevity of mathematics (a science with which he is so well acquainted) in the cause of metaphysics: and having thereby been enabled to plant the standard of *Philosophical Liberty* on a strength, from which the advocates of the opposite doctrine have not found it convenient to attempt to dislodge him. One faint effort indeed was made by a writer in the Monthly Review for July 1781. But this was so easily repelled by the author in a second edition of his Tract, that, so far as I can learn, the attempt has not been repeated.

[a] For these two descriptions of characters, and for that of the Unitarians, placed in direct opposition to both, as the only "enlightened and consistent Christians," the reader may turn to what Mr. B. has said, *Review*, pp. 26—30. 196. 199. 220. 230. 233. Indeed it should be stated in justice to Mr. B., that the charges of incompetency, insincerity, and slavish adherence to popular systems, are not confined by him to the divines of the Established Church. Some not a little distinguished amongst the Dissenters, are examples of the impartiality of his strictures. Even the pious, candid, and learned Doddridge had adopted an "erroneous and unscriptural system." "His love of popularity," with other causes, had "strangely warped his judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures;" and his works are, consequently, "not calculated to instruct his readers in the true sense of the Christian Scriptures, nor to infuse into them a spirit of *rational* and *manly* piety." (pp. 102, 103. 213, 214.) He had unfortunately retained some of those old-fashioned notions about *atonement* and *grace*, which have been vulgarly supposed to distinguish Christianity from natural religion. He was not, in short, a *Rational Dissenter:* for it is not from the members of the Establishment solely, but from the various other classes of dissenters, that the grand characteristic of *Rationality* divides the Unitarian.

For the fulfilment of the engagement, to overturn every interpretation of Scripture that wars with the simple creed of the Unitarian, Mr. B. refers us,—for he has not thought proper to undertake the task himself,—to a list of commentators, on whose critical exertions he is willing to rest his cause. Here we find, in addition to some respectable names, and to some from whom his peculiar opinions will not receive much support, the names of "Wakefield, Evanson, Lindsey, and Priestley."[a] These last being the only persons now[b] living, of those whom he has enumerated as the great oracles of Gospel interpretation, to these of course he must principally refer, when he affirms, as we have seen, that "the Unitarians pledge themselves" to get rid of every passage in Scripture that militates against the principles of their system. Now, I do agree with Mr. B., that if he had traversed the entire range of all who profess to have a single shred of Christianity hanging to them, he could not have found a phalanx more admirably fitted, by the apparatus of "interpolations, omissions, false readings, mistranslations, and erroneous interpretations,"[c] to empty Scripture of every idea, that does not correspond with the *pure* Christianity of those

[a] *Review*, p. 206.

[b] It is a matter of melancholy reflection, that of the abovenamed writers, all actively engaged in the propagation of their respective opinions when the first edition of this work was published, not one is at this day living. So rapidly do we all pass off in this fleeting scene of things!—Respecting those who no longer live to answer for themselves, I confess I feel somewhat of the force of the maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. And yet, when it is considered, that though the man dies, the author lives: that the interests of the living should not be sacrificed to a sentiment unprofitable to the dead; that, on the contrary, were the deceased himself to rise from the grave, he would probably feel it his first duty to oppose those very errors which he had before been industrious to disseminate;—there seems no good reason, why any greater delicacy should now be used in treating of the pernicious mistakes and misconceptions of such writers, than had formerly been observed; more particularly as the subject is infinitely too important for compromise. "Nec nocet veritas mortuis, et multum prodest vivis," is undoubtedly a maxim deserving some consideration. I have, then, on the entire view of the case, neither retracted nor softened any observation applying to the works of the abovenamed authors, unless where I have had cause to doubt the truth and justice of the observation itself.

[c] *Review*, p. 206.

who call themselves Unitarians. Paine could not well have been added to the list. *He* most *imprudently* strikes down all at once, and would brush away the flimsy cobwebs, of both Old and New Testament, at one stroke. But, certainly more[a] resolute expungers, parers, and diversifiers of Sacred Writ, he could not have discovered in the whole tribe of polemics. Of their powers in this way some few specimens have been exhibited, in the foregoing *Dissertations;* and, from the notable exertions of master-criticism, which have been there occasionally noticed, little doubt can be entertained of the sufficiency of these writers to fulfil the engagement entered into on their behalf by Mr. Belsham.

Our author himself, indeed, has favoured us with but few displays of his critical ingenuity. Those few, however, prove him by no means unworthy of the cause which he supports. The two passages, which expressly ascribe the office of *intercession* to Christ, are, (Rom. viii. 34,) *He is now at the right*

[a] Dr. Geddes has travelled too slowly through the Old Testament, to entitle him, by his meritorious services in the New, to a place in the *present* list. But from the *liberal* views which the part of his translation already published, joined to his late volume of *Critical Remarks*, presents, concerning the *false representations of the Deity in the Pentateuch*,—the *cruel and sanguinary character of the God of the Hebrews*,—the *juggle of the miracles said to be wrought by Moses*,—the *incredible number of prodigies not literally to be believed*,—the *frequent interposition of the Deity and his agents, not to be admitted*,—the *absurdity of attributing inspiration to the writers of the early books of the Old Testament*,—the *error, inconsistence, and downright absurdity, to be found in the Hebrew writings, from which their inspiration cannot be credited, even on the authority of St. Paul, or though an angel from Heaven were to teach it*,—the *information of the Hebrew historians derived from public registers, popular traditions, and old songs*,—from these, and other observations of a similar nature, there is offered a reasonable promise, that when this translator of the BOOKS ACCOUNTED SACRED shall have extended his researches to the New Testament, and thereby clearly made known *his* scheme of *Christianity*, he will prove himself fully entitled to have his name enrolled among the most enlightened of Mr. B.'s Unitarian commentators. When we find him thus freely concurring with Lord Bolingbroke, in pronouncing the God of *Moses* to be "partial, unjust, and cruel, delighting in blood, commanding assassinations, massacres, and even exterminations of people," can we doubt, that he will agree with his Lordship, and other *philosophic* inquirers, in viewing the God of *Paul* in a light equally unworthy of our religious adoration?—*Bolingbroke's Works*, vol. v. p. 567.—4to. 1754.

The earthly career of Dr. Geddes has been closed since the above was written: nor did he live long enough to carry his mischievous perversions of Scripture beyond the limit of the Pentateuch and the historical books.

hand of God, making intercession for us; and, (Hebr. vii. 25,) *He ever liveth to make intercession for us.* Now, as Mr. B. cannot allow to Christ the office of intercessor, he begins with remarking, that "the exact import of the phrase is difficult to be ascertained" in these passages: and for this he assigns a reason, which cannot be denied to be sufficient, that "probably *the writers themselves annexed to it no very distinct idea.*"[a] St. Paul, it is clear, was no *Rational* Christian; or he would not have used words so inaccurately and unphilosophically; for, besides the aforesaid vagueness of expression, it is certain, that "God *has no right hand at which Jesus can stand*, to intercede!"[b] By this philosophical discovery, the authority of St. Paul is completely and at once set aside. His words, it is shown, admit no precise meaning. That, however, which St. Paul *ought* to have said, Mr. B. informs us: viz. "that Jesus, having been advanced to great dignity and felicity, is, by the appointment of God, continually employing his renovated and improved powers, in some unknown way, for the benefit of his church." We are told, that "we may *imagine* what we please, but that more than this is not revealed;" of which it unfortunately happens, that not one word is revealed—except by Mr. Belsham, St. Paul having simply said, that Christ *is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us.*—God, however, has *no right hand;* and *interceding* does not mean, *interceding*[c].

[a] *Review*, pp. 69, 70.

[b] *Review*, p. 70.

[c] Mr. Belsham's remark on the force of the original word, rendered by us, *making intercession*, deserves to be noticed. "The word," he says, "expresses any interference of one person *for* or *against* another." Now, from this it follows, that if Christ be not supposed to interfere *for us*, he must be employed in exercising his powers *against us*. Does Mr. B. prefer this to the received sense? It appears, however, that he has borrowed his view of this passage from Dr. Taylor's note on Rom. viii. 27, as he refers us to that for full satisfaction. Such then is the joint light of Dr. Taylor and Mr. Belsham. But it seems necessary to remind Mr. B. of the difference between ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ and ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπέρ. I must therefore take the liberty of referring him to his Lexicon. Or, if he *will* look to Commentators, perhaps were he to consult Locke and Pierce,—two of those very commentators whom he himself has named, but seems to have *named only* as giving a grace and character to his list, whilst they certainly deserve to have been placed in better company,—he would find their interpretation decidedly in

With a few other criticisms of the like nature Mr. Belsham has enriched his work. He has, however, not adventured far

favour of that, which no scholar can question to be the sense of the original *interceding*. As the authority of a *German* commentator is likely also to have considerable weight with Mr. B., I would recommend it to him to attend to Rosenmüller's distinction, (Rom. xi. 2,)—"Ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπέρ τινος, est *negotium alicujus commendare, intercedere pro aliquo*; ἐντυγχάνειν κατά τινος, est *aliquem accusare:*" so says Schleusner likewise, (who deserves to be particularly consulted on the word ἐντυγχάνω,) and so say all the Lexicons. Mr. B., however, says otherwise. "Time, labour, patience, and candour," have, no doubt, convinced him that they are wrong.

As Mr. B. has referred to Dr. Taylor, for the true and adequate sense of the original word in these passages, it is but fair to state that writer's observations on the force of the term as applied in Rom. viii. 27. "The Spirit of God *makes intercession for the saints*, not by making application to God on their behalf, but by directing and qualifying *their* supplications in a proper manner, by his *agency and influences upon their hearts; which, according to the Gospel scheme, is the peculiar work and office of the* HOLY SPIRIT." What then? Is Dr. Taylor, *he* who has so "well explained the Jewish phrases in his *admirable Key*,"—is *he*, after all, but one of those "popular interpreters," who, in opposition to the "Rational Christian," contend for the idle notion of the *existence* and *influence* of the *Holy Spirit*? And does *he*, to whom Mr. B. refers, for a full explanation of the original phrase commonly rendered in the sense of *making intercession for us*, expound the words ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ, when applied to the Holy Spirit, as signifying that benevolent interference, whereby our supplications are rendered more acceptable and effectual with our Almighty Father? The same words, it is clear, cannot be instantly purged of this meaning, when they are applied by the same writer, in a few lines after, to the case of our blessed Lord: so that I fear much, that when Mr. B. comes to reconsider this matter, he will be obliged to repudiate his boasted auxiliary, Dr. Taylor, as *ittle better* than *orthodox*.

What had been thus given, in the former editions of this work, as matter of speculation, has now become matter of fact: Mr. Belsham, in his latter views of this subject, has carefully omitted the mention of Dr. Taylor. He finds it much safer to place his reliance on Mr. Lindsey; an authority which is not likely to fail him in any Unitarian perversion of the sense of Scripture. And, with his assistance having first explained the word ἐντυγχάνω, as expressing any kind of interference whatever, he arrives at this conclusion, that what is called the *intercession* of Christ implies the "operation and effect of his mission and doctrine in the world." (*Calm Inquiry*, &c., p. 327.) In like manner, the Unitarian Version, to which he refers, and in which probably he but quotes himself. For an admirable exposure of the absurdity of the interpretation thus given by Mr. Belsham and his Unitarian Version, I refer the reader to *Dr. Nares's Remarks*, pp. 140—144. I shall only add, for the purpose of showing how miserably unfit the Editors of this Version are for the work which they have undertaken, that in their note on this word in Rom. viii. 34, whilst they profess to give the interpretation of it by *Schleusner*, (an authority to which I had formerly taken the liberty of referring Mr. Belsham,) they garble and actually falsify his application of the term; and again, that in their note on the same word in Hebr. vii. 26, they repeat the identical error of reference into which Schleusner had fallen, quot-

into the field of controversy. He has trusted rather to abstract reasoning upon what he calls philosophical principles; and whilst he has confined himself to the stringing together of a number of rapid conclusions from plausible premisses, or to what is vulgarly styled[a] declamation, he has left it to the more critical advocates of Unitarianism to *prove*, that the words of Scripture bear that meaning which he everywhere *assumes*. Indeed, this work, the professed object of which is to try the doctrines of the Gospel by the standard of Scripture, no less than by that of reason, is so miserably deficient in the point of critical inquiry, that its avowed admirers, the

ing Acts xxvii. 24, instead of Acts xxv. 24: and this too, whilst they are engaged in enumerating the precise parts of the New Testament in which the word is to be found, and would have us believe that they have consulted those very passages for its meaning: thus evincing, at the same time, their servile adherence to any authority on which they may choose to rely, and their negligent rashness united with affected research in matters relating to the accuracy of the sacred text.

[a] One of the finest possible specimens of the species of *criticism* that goes by this name, is to be found in another publication of Mr. *Belsham's*, which I have already noticed, entitled *Letters on Arianism*. At p. 129 of that work, he attacks the absurdity of deducing from the language used throughout the New Testament respecting the *creation of all things by Jesus Christ*, the strange conclusion, that by him a creation was literally effected. He admits, indeed, that in Ephesians iii. 9, it is said, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ:"—that in Heb. i. 2, it is said, "by whom also he made the worlds:"—and again in Colossians i. 15, 16, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." But after launching against these, the usual Socinian refutations—that *creating* does not mean *creating*, and that *worlds* are *dispensations*, &c., &c.,—he proceeds, by a still happier flight, to show that the same language is as applicable to *Bonaparte* as to *Jesus Christ*. I give his words.—"Of a certain person, who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France is a being of superior order to mankind, much less that he is the maker of the world? *The language which is true of Bonaparte, in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral view; but it no more implies pre-existence, or proper creative power, in one case than in the other"!* This comment of Mr. Belsham requires no comment from me.

Analytical Reviewers, feel it necessary to admit, whilst they endeavour to vindicate, this defect.—"We have said, this is a popular work. The reader must not look into it for verbal criticism, or the citation of ancient authority." But they add, in excuse, "the work to which it is a reply, was altogether declamation."[a] And if so, it has undoubtedly been answered in its own way.

I have now done with Mr. Belsham; nor should I have directed the attention of the reader so much to this gentleman's performance, had I known any other work[b], than the

[a] *Review for March*, 1798.

[b] That part of the Unitarian creed, which relates to the person and character of our Lord, has received some additional touches from the hand of Mr. Belsham, in a work recently published; which he entitles, *A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ*; and in which he professes to give a formal digest of the recognised opinions of the Unitarians upon this subject in the year 1811. Of this digest I select the few passages which follow.—"The Unitarian doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties,"—"that he was born in low circumstances, having no peculiar advantages of education, or learning," &c.—"The Unitarians maintain, that Jesus and his Apostles were supernaturally instructed as far as was necessary for the execution of their commission, that is, for the revelation and proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally with the Jews; and that Jesus, and his Apostles, and others of the primitive believers, were occasionally inspired to foretell future events. But they believe that supernatural inspiration was limited to these cases alone: and that when Jesus or his Apostles deliver opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of their mission, such opinions, and their reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and caution with those of other persons in similar circumstances, of similar education, and with similar habits of thinking." (Pp. 447. 451.) Here then is an improved view of the case: a manifest progress in the Unitarian system. The supernatural instruction vouchsafed to our Lord was strictly limited to the object of his mission: this object was, exclusively, to make known the doctrine of eternal life, and the admission of the Gentiles to divine favour equally with the Jews: in all matters not connected with this object, the opinions and reasonings of our Lord are to be esteemed of no greater value than those of any person of similar circumstances and education, he being subject to the same ignorance and prejudices to which the common nature of man is subject: and as he was of low circumstances and had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, of course it follows, upon the whole, that the opinions and reasonings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ are (except when they relate to the doctrine of a future life and universal retribution) to to be treated with as little respect, as those of any person of low origin and circumstances who had received as few advantages of learning or education. I have not carried on the argument as regarding the Apostles, for Mr. Belsham and his associates have long ago dis-

Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise, in which the entire system and bearings of the doctrines called *Unitarian* are exhibited with equal brevity, distinctness, and candour. To Mr. B. is certainly due the praise of an honest and open avowal of his sentiments. And, in his work, as I doubt not

posed of the Epistles. But how much of the Gospels must now follow them as waste paper?—Yet farther, it is not merely the *ignorance and prejudices*, to which our Lord was *as subject as other men*, that we have to guard against in his opinions and reasonings on all topics, save the one above excepted; but we have also to secure ourselves against the consequences of those *infirmities and frailties* of all descriptions which are incident to human nature, and to which our Lord was not less liable than other human beings. Thus, according to Mr. Belsham, the moral as well as the intellectual imperfections, which render the opinions and reasonings of men, and more particularly of men who have had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, liable to error and exception, alike affect the opinions and reasonings of our blessed Lord; save only on that one subject, to which, Mr. Belsham informs us, his commission was rigidly restricted. As Mr. Belsham's language seems here to cast a reflection on the moral character of our Lord, it is but justice to Mr. B. to state what he has expressly said upon that point. "The moral character of Christ, through the whole course of his *public ministry*, as recorded by the Evangelists, is pure and unimpeachable in every particular. Whether this perfection of character in *public* life, combined with the general declaration of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus, through the whole course of his *private* life, was completely exempt from all the errors and failings of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion." (p. 190.)

Here Mr. Belsham admits, that we have no actual proof of any sinful acts committed by our Lord in his private life, so that we cannot positively and satisfactorily pronounce any thing upon that head. But it must be observed, that this admission has been made after the recital of certain declarations of Scripture, that "he knew no sin;" that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth;" and others of the same import:—although, as these declarations do not relate to the object of Christ's mission as stated by Mr. Belsham, it is difficult to discover to what credit they are entitled upon the principle which he has laid down. In a distant part of his work, however, in which he was sufficiently removed from the influence of the above testimonies, and when he prepares himself to sum up resolutely the articles of the Unitarian creed, he rises above the weakness into which he had here allowed himself to fall; and (as we have seen in the two preceding pages) affirms of that great Being, who came to redeem the world from sin, that he was subject to the common infirmities and frailties of human nature. It will not now appear surprising, that Mr. Belsham and his Unitarian associates are so extremely anxious to establish the apocryphal Gospel of the Nazarenes to be the true original Gospel of St. Matthew: for that Gospel, as *Jerem. Jones* (a favourite with the Unitarians) has shown, in his *Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 376, has left us reason to believe, that "*Christ was a sinner, or at least that it is doubtful whether he was so or not*"!

in his life, are exhibited strong traits of talent, combined with amiable and virtuous feeling. The same freedom with which he has treated others, and with which, were he to offer any animadversions on these volumes[a], his pen would be directed towards me, I have not scrupled to use with him. If I have misrepresented him, it certainly has not been my intention. His language, I confess, has offended me by its arrogance: and perhaps the feeling which that would naturally excite may have dictated a mode of reply, not always sufficiently respectful. If any thing like asperity or sarcasm has escaped me, I wish it to be considered as applied to the cause, and to the manner of supporting it, rather than to the writer himself. His opinions, as undermining the best interests of human kind; and his style, like that of all the writers of the same side of the question, as tending to overbear by an imposing confidence of tone, and a familiar and frontless assumption of superiority, can scarcely be received without indignation[b], or met without warmth. I do not pretend to have

[a] It is now more than fourteen years since the first publication of this work: and, during that time, neither Mr. Belsham nor any of his learned Unitarian fellow-labourers have, so far as I know, favoured the public with any observations upon the arguments which it contains. Dr. Priestley, if I recollect rightly, about the year 1790, stated in one of the public prints, that, his *History of Early Opinions* having remained a long time unanswered, if the same silence should be observed during a limited period which he specified, he would consider it as an acknowledgment on the part of the whole Christian world that it was unanswerable. In this I will not presume to follow Dr. Priestley's example. It had better become Dr. Priestley to suppose, that his work had not received an answer, because it was not deemed of sufficient moment to demand one. It must surely become me to suppose the same of mine. At the same time, I cannot but rejoice, that its reception and circulation have been such as to give good reason to believe, that there is no small portion of the community to whom it appears to contain useful matter: and I shall certainly feel most sincere satisfaction, if it be allowed to continue to work its silent way without the noise and the exasperation of controversy.

[b] I cannot allow myself to employ the term which Mr. B. does not scruple to combine with this, on much slighter provocation,—"*contempt.*" (*Review*, p. 64.) And yet,—to pass from Mr. Belsham to the entire class of his fellow-labourers, and to speak, not of the individual, but of the cause at large, and of its champions,—what can be more fitly calculated to excite even the feeling which that term expresses, than the impotent and arrogant attempts of a few loquacious sciolists, directed against the sublime and solid truths of Revelation? *Bishop Watson*, whose tolerant moderation is the subject of general praise, is forced to exclaim, that "it cannot but move one's indignation, to

been free from the impression of these feelings. I trust, however, I have not permitted them to carry me beyond the due limits. My object has been truth: and my wish, not unnecessarily to hurt the feelings of Mr. B. or of those who, with him, assume the title of *Unitarians*. If, to the body of

see a smattering in philosophy urged as an argument against the veracity of an Apostle." (*Two Apologies*, &c., p. 359.)—What shall be said, when the same sort of smattering is employed to overturn the whole edifice of Christianity, to subvert the sanctioned wisdom of ages, and to overwhelm in one shapeless ruin the joint structure of learning and inspiration?—The *Dean of Winchester*, who is so justly distinguished for the brilliancy of his talents, the richness of his acquirements, and the eloquence and vigour of his style, has described the modern Socinianism, as "consisting of a train of whimsical paradoxes, the mere abortions of the mind! strange without originality, dull without sobriety, flippant without wit, and contagious without allurement." (*Discourses on various Subjects*, p. 145.)—A feature equally appropriate, and more offensive, because more insulting and more mischievous, remains to be added to the picture; namely, an imposing affection of superior knowledge, without possessing any of its attainments. That grandest of all mischiefs, which an admired ancient has described as, Ἀμαθία τις μάλα χαλεπὴ, δοκοῦσα εἶναι μεγίστη Φρόνησις, eminently belongs to the race of modern Socinians, or Unitarians as they choose to call themselves, and requires of course only to be unmasked in order to be put down. To this, I confess, my efforts (throughout this Appendix especially) have been particularly directed: and so anxious have I been to effect this point, which in such a case I conceive to be vital, that I have not hesitated to expose myself to those imputations, which are generally cast upon the liberality and the politeness of the writer, who scruples not to press home-truths in a direct manner, without fear, and without compromise. If I have had the good fortune to accomplish this object, I am satisfied to submit to whatever consequences may follow.

I am not, indeed, without the apprehension, that I may appear to assume somewhat too much in the application of the following passage from Bishop Warburton; and yet it approaches so nearly to the state of my own feelings, in winding up this Appendix, that I cannot avoid transcribing it. In speaking of the particular manner in which he had thought it right to treat the pernicious sophistries which were opposed to the fundamental truths of Christianity, that glowing and powerful writer thus expresses himself.—"He knows what the *gentle* reader thinks of it. But he is not one of those opposers of Infidelity, who can reason without earnestness, and confute without warmth. He leaves it to others, to the soft Divine, and courtly Controversialist, to combat the most flagitious tenets with serenity; or maintain the most awful of religious truths in a way, that misleads the unwary reader into an opinion of their making but little impression on the writer's own heart. For himself, he freely owns, he is apt to kindle as he writes; and would even blush to repel an insult on sense and virtue with less vigour than every honest man is expected to show in his own cause."—*Remarks on Hume's Essay*, &c., p. 12.

Such observations as have been added to the Appendix, since the appearance of the first Edition of this work, it has been thought right to introduce in the form of Notes, so as to leave the text (as it originally stood) unaltered.

that denomination at large, I have attributed sentiments and opinions which they do not recognise as justly imputable, it is to Mr. Belsham, not to me, they are to ascribe the error. My representation of their peculiar tenets has been chiefly derived from the work which he has given to the public with the express purpose of promulging, and vindicating, the creed of the *Unitarians*, or *Rational Christians*. If he has not been a faithful interpreter of their opinions, it is for them to correct the mistake. Hitherto that publication has been circulated, as the *Unitarian Manual;* and, whatever reception it may have experienced from others, has certainly *seemed* to obtain among that description of Christians no small portion of applause.

REMARKS

ON

THE UNITARIAN VERSION

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Mr. Belsham's engagement on behalf of the Unitarian critics, to which allusion has been made at pp. 64, 65, of this volume, has in fact been fulfilled by the Version of the New Testament which has lately issued from the press; and which, as appears by a note on the beginning of the first Epistle of St. John, has been founded principally upon the labours of those able expositors and associates of Mr. Belsham, to whom we have been there referred. I hold myself therefore now bound, in point of justice, to retract (so far at least as the New Testament is concerned) what I had ventured to pronounce, in pp. 115, 116, of vol. i., concerning the unlikelihood of any Unitarian version of the Scripture being given to the public. It must however be confessed, that, by what has been done, these Unitarian expositors have not much abridged the liberty for which they so strenuously contend. Their version is of that convenient latitude, that a person may, at the same time, admit its authority, and yet disbelieve almost every doctrine, and every important truth, of the Christian Revelation.

The Editors of this work have not, it must be observed, conducted themselves in the publication of it with that manly

boldness, which they are at all times so ambitious to put forward as their distinguishing characteristic. They have, on the contrary, not scrupled to adopt one of those *pious frauds*, which they are pleased to consider the ordinary expedients of their orthodox opponents. The name of a Bishop of the Established Church was calculated to lull suspicion, and to contribute to a more extended circulation; and, accordingly, this *Improved Version*, which they have now sent abroad, they profess to found *upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's translation* of the New Testament; whilst, in truth, they adopt no part of that translation, which in any degree shackles them in point of doctrine, but abide by it in such places only as are of a nature perfectly indifferent. They have thus contrived to give a respectable name to their Unitarian blasphemies. They thus hold out deceitful colours to the unwary, and vend their poisons under a false label.

To give any adequate idea of the nature of this *Improved Version* within the limits to which we are here necessarily confined would be impossible. The reader may easily conceive that the whole apparatus of "interpolations, omissions, false readings, mistranslations, and erroneous interpretations," on which, as we have seen, Mr. Belsham places so firm a reliance, has been fully brought to bear, and has most thoroughly performed its work, in the forging of this last great production of the Unitarian foundery. A few particulars, however, which may suffice to give some faint notion of the design and execution of the performance, I cannot but advert to.

In the Introduction of the work (p. v.) we are fairly apprized, that it has been a principal part of its design, to "divest the Sacred Volume of the technical phrases of a systematic theology."—That is, in other words, we are told, that the great object has been, so to render the New Testament, as to empty it of all such expressions, as might give support to any of the received and peculiar doctrines of Christianity. This appears pretty manifestly to be what is here intended: for, agreeably to this, we find that all those phrases, which in

any way connect with the unscriptural notions of the *miraculous conception*, the *pre-existence*, and the *divinity of Christ*, —the *personal existence*, *divine nature*, and *gracious influences*, *of the Holy Spirit*,—the *existence of evil spirits and angels*, *&c.*—are completely swept away; and nothing left to us, but what perfectly agrees with Mr. Belsham's idea,—that Christianity comprises a good moral system, with indeed the knowledge of this one fact, that a man has risen from the grave.—In the next place we are told, what sufficiently explains how this has been effected. It is stated, that it has not been the intention, "to exhibit a version critically correct in every minute particular;" and that "*verbal criticism* had of course not been attended to in the degree that some might wish and expect." (p. vi.)—Thus we are fairly informed, that certain liberties are to be taken in the translation, to which the minuteness of verbal criticism might possibly present some impediment. That is, in a work, whose very object is to ascertain the exact meaning of words, the exact meaning of words is not to be attended to, lest it might embarrass the freedom of translation, and force upon the translator, a sense different from that which he chooses to assign. Of what nature are those freedoms in translation, which have grown out of the facilities, and are adapted to the objects, which the Editors have here planned for themselves, I shall now give two or three slight specimens.

The first which I shall mention relates to the doctrine of the *Incarnation*, which is at once thrown off, by rejecting from the beginning of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the whole of what belongs to the miraculous birth of our Lord. This has been done, it must be allowed, with sufficient boldness; for it is fairly admitted, that these portions of the Gospels "are to be found in all the MSS. and versions now extant."—Now it is actually amusing to observe, what is the leading evidence, by which the Editors conceive themselves justified, thus to expunge from the canon of Scripture, what has come supported by the testimony of *all* the Manuscripts and *all* the versions. With respect to the passage in

Matthew, they tell us, that the *Ebionites* did not read the two first chapters in their copy of his Gospel; and with respect to St. Luke, they tell us, that *Marcion*, a heretic of the 2d century, did not admit the two first chapters of his. Therefore, it follows, that since the sect of the *Ebionites*, and the heretic *Marcion* of the 2d century, are against all the Manuscripts and all the Versions, it is impossible that these last can be received as true. The argument is certainly quite intelligible. But let us inquire a little about these irrefragable witnesses.

And, first, as to these *Ebionites*, we are informed, that their Canon of the New Testament rejected the three last Gospels, and all the Epistles of St. Paul. And, next, as to this *Marcion*, we find, that he rejected the Old Testament, and every part of the New which contained quotations from the Old, and that he used no Gospel but that of St. Luke, expunging from this also whatever he did not approve: and we are told these things too, upon the very authority, on which the Editors build, respecting the omissions from St. Matthew and St. Luke.—Why then have not these admirers of *Marcion* and the *Ebionites* received the testimony of such unimpeached witnesses throughout? Why have they not, on the authority of the latter, rejected all the New Testament except St. Matthew; or, on the authority of the former, rejected the entire of the Old Testament, and all the New excepting a part of St. Luke and some of the Epistles: or, on the authority of both together, why have they not rejected the whole Bible, both Old and New Testament?—But it seems, that these witnesses are to be brought up and turned down at pleasure: they are both good and bad, according as may serve the present purpose. For, not only do we find, that they are not believed, by the party producing them, in any part of their testimony except that which relates to the beginnings of the two Gospels; but we find that, even in these, they are believed only so far as is convenient: our Editors themselves admitting, that the *Ebionites* had mutilated the Gospel of St. Matthew, by *taking away* the *gene-*

alogy; that is, by taking away the first 16 verses of the first chapter. And therefore respecting these first 16 verses, the Editors reject the testimony of the *Ebionites* as being convicted of a mutilation of the Gospel; but as to the remaining verses of the first chapter and the whole of the second, they hold the testimony of these same *Ebionites* to be good against all gainsayers, against all Manuscripts, and against all Versions.—All this is put forward honestly and without any attempt at disguise. The Ebionite witnesses pronounced, on one side of a leaf, as not credible, from their acknowedged mutilation of the sacred text; and upon the other side of the same leaf, maintained to be witnesses of such repute, as ought to be relied upon, in opposition to all the MSS. and all the Versions of the New Testament in the whole world.

But that we may form a better judgment of the value of this Ebionite testimony according to the showing of its Unitarian abettors, let us attend to a few more particulars on this head. The gospel of the Ebionites began, it is said, with these words, *It came to pass*, IN THE DAYS OF HEROD KING OF JUDEA, *that* JOHN CAME BAPTISING *with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.* This the Editors distinctly state, in their third note, from the authority of Epiphanius; whilst in the very note which precedes they reject the text of St. Matthew, expressly because it places the birth of Christ before the death of Herod; which event they contend, from Luke iii. 23, must have taken place two years at least before Christ was born. Thus, the gospel ascribed to Matthew is spurious, because it fixes the birth of Christ before the death of Herod; and yet the gospel of the Ebionites, which fixes it not less than thirty years before that event, (inasmuch as it represents Herod to be alive at the commencement of the Baptist's ministry,) is notwithstanding to be relied on as a genuine and indisputable document.

Yet farther,—for the Editors seem ambitious to make an overpowering display of the riches of their criticism on the first opening of their work—they inform us from Epiphanius,

that Cerinthus and Carpocrates argued, from *the genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel*, that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary; whilst, at the same time, they acquaint us, that the gospel which was used by Cerinthus and Carpocrates was *the gospel of the Ebionites*, to which they admit no genealogy was prefixed, or from which (to use their own and Epiphanius's words) *the genealogy was taken away*. This, it will be confessed, is making a tolerably large demand upon the complaisance of the reader; yet there remains still more occasion for his courtesy, if he will travel on amicably with the Editors even through the first two pages of their translation.

The *genealogy* appears, upon the first view, to be a difficulty in their way, which they have themselves unnecessarily created. The Ebionites they have produced, as their favourite witnesses, to ascertain what was the true and original gospel of St. Matthew. But the Ebionites omit the entire of the first two chapters of that Gospel. Why then injure their evidence by contending for the *genealogy*, which they reject? The reason is plainly assigned. The genealogy, as it stands, may answer the purpose of proving that Jesus was the offspring of Joseph and Mary; and, accordingly, the Editors apprize us, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates applied it to this use, and hence deduced the mere humanity of Christ. They proceed also to show the reasonableness of admitting the genealogy to be genuine, on the ground, that "it can hardly be supposed, that an author writing for the instruction of Hebrew Christians would have omitted to trace the descent of Christ from Abraham and David, upon which they justly laid so great a stress." They then proceed to evince the like reasonableness of discarding all that follows the genealogy to the end of the second chapter. "This" (they say) "COULD NOT *have been written by the author of the genealogy, for it* CONTRADICTS HIS DESIGN, which was to prove that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David; whereas the design of this narrative is to show that Joseph, the reputed

father of Jesus, was not his real father. This account, therefore, of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ must have been wanting in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, as well as in those of the Ebionites: and *if the genealogy be genuine, this narrative* MUST BE *spurious.*"

Thus, then, the whole matter is completely arranged. The genealogy must be genuine, as marking the human descent of Christ from Abraham and David; a thing expected by the Jews: and by all who received *it* as genuine, the narrative of the miraculous conception, as contradicting its design, must be rejected as spurious. At the same time, lest we should imagine that the force of this reasoning might have operated so powerfully upon those Hebrew Christians who received the genealogy and maintained the proper humanity of Christ as to induce them to *take away* the narrative which so directly contradicted the genealogy, in like manner as it is admitted that others of them had *taken away* the genealogy itself, the Editors take care, in the very next note, to assure us, that to that description of Christians "the account of the miraculous conception could not have been in any degree unacceptable:" "*nor would it*" (they add) "*at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ;* it being a fact analogous to the miraculous birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons of the Hebrew nation." Thus it appears that the history of the miraculous conception is itself something miraculous; for it at the same time *contradicts*, and yet *does not at all militate against*, the idea of Christ's human descent.

Now, perhaps, it may be doing no more than justice to these erudite and luminous commentators, to bring together into one point of view the scattered lights which have been here distinctly noticed; but which cannot fail, from their combined brilliancy, to shed a brighter glory upon the work which they are designed to illustrate.—1. The Ebionites and Marcion have omitted, in their respective copies of certain portions of Scripture, passages which are undoubtedly parts of the genuine sacred text; and the former (it is confessed)

have actually *taken away* the genealogy from St. Matthew's Gospel: the proof, therefore, arising from their omission of whatever relates to the miraculous conception of Christ, must be received as decisive against that fact, although it is admitted that the narratives of it, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, come attested by every manuscript and every version now extant, without exception.—2. The Gospel of St. Matthew, as it is conveyed to us at this day by all the MSS. and all the versions, cannot be genuine, because it requires us to believe that our Lord was born before the death of Herod; but we may admit as unquestionable the Gospel of the Ebionites, which pronounces Herod to be living at the commencement of the Baptist's ministry, or about the thirtieth year after our Lord's nativity. Lastly, the narrative of the miraculous conception ascribed to Saint Matthew must have been rejected by all who received the genealogy, as contradicting the design of the genealogy, which was to establish the human descent of Christ; at the same time that it is quite clear, that the fact of the miraculous conception could not at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ, nor consequently have been in any degree unacceptable to those who held that doctrine.—Such are the new views presented at the opening of this *Improved Version*, which is to set every thing to rights in the Christian Scriptures! See pp. 1, 2, 3. 5, and also p. 121.

There are, moreover, certain chronological deductions connected with some of the foregoing observations, which I cannot avoid laying before the reader. Three pages back it has been stated, that the Editors contend that *the death of Herod must have taken place two years at least before Christ was born*. Their mode of establishing this point is deserving of some detail. It follows, they say, as a necessary consequence from the death of Herod being placed (as it is by Lardner) in the year 750, or 751, U. C. Lardner, in the part referred to by the Editors, (p. 129,) had asserted, that "if Herod died in 750 U. C. he died *three years and nine months before the* VULGAR CHRISTIAN ERA; if at a certain time be-

fore mentioned in the year 751, then he died about *two years and nine months before the said era:*" and which is the truth, he professes himself unable to determine. (See *Lardner's Works*, vol. i. p. 428.) Our Editors, referring to Lardner, (twice upon the same subject, at p. 2, and at p. 129,) contend, peremptorily, that Christ "MUST HAVE BEEN BORN *at least two years and nine months, and probably three years and nine months, after the death of Herod:*" and thus, in utter disregard of all the arguments by which the Vulgar Christian Era has been disproved, or rather with an apparent ignorance of the existence of any such arguments, they have at once assumed the vulgar and the true era of our Lord's nativity to be the same; and on this assumption, as in itself sufficient to invalidate the whole story of our Lord's birth as given by St. Matthew, they build the rejection of that story as an utter fabrication. They profess at the same time to ground their reasoning on the authority of *Lardner;* whose main object has been to establish the direct reverse of their position,—that Christ "must have been born two years at least after the death of Herod;"—inasmuch as, with great learning and sound argument, he has laboured to demonstrate the consistency of St. Luke's declaration respecting the age of Christ in the 15th of Tiberius, with the narrative of St. Matthew, which places the birth of Christ about two years before the death of Herod. (*Lardner's Works*, vol. i. pp. 339—382.) That learned writer, however, in his *Appendix concerning the time of Herod's death*, has, unfortunately for our Editors, in the passage above referred to, spoken of the *Vulgar Christian Era* as posterior to the death of Herod: and they, substituting for the *Vulgar Christian Era* the *time of Christ's nativity*, have at once inferred the priority of Herod's death to the birth of Christ, and have adduced the authority of Lardner's name in behalf of a position which Lardner has most triumphantly overthrown.

A similar instance of careful reference to authorities, and minute attention to the accuracies of Ecclesiastical History, is presented to us in the very front of this elaborate perform-

ance, which I cannot avoid adverting to in this place. The Editors, whilst dealing out in their *Introduction* large portions of that knowledge of manuscripts and the various critical apparatus for the translation of the New Testament, which Wetstein, Michaelis, Griesbach, and others, had already amply supplied, take occasion to speak of *Ephrem the Syrian*, as "a writer of SOME NOTE in the SIXTH century." (P. xiv.) In this at least they have thought and spoken for themselves: the commonly received opinion having hitherto been, that Ephrem flourished about the *middle of the* FOURTH *century*. From *Asseman* we learn, that he was present at the council of Nice, in the year 325: and we are told by *Jerome*, that he died in the time of the Emperor Valens, that is, at some time before the year 379. We are also informed by the early authorities, that this same Ephrem, who is here so slightly glanced at as "*a writer of some note*," was a person of the most distinguished celebrity; a man, of whom Jerome says, "ad tantam venit claritudinem, ut post lectionem Scripturarum publice in quibusdam ecclesiis ejus scripta recitentur:" who is described by *Ebedjesu*, a learned Syrian of the 13th century, "Ephræm magnus, qui appellatus est Syrorum propheta;" who was even entitled by the Syrians, "the doctor of the whole world;" and who, in truth, with the consent of all who have hitherto made mention of him, has been estimated as one of the most illustrious divines and writers in the century in which he lived, that is, as we have seen, in the *fourth century*. The Editors of the *Improved Version*, however, acquaint us, that he was "*a writer of some note in the sixth century*." It is the less pardonable, I may add, in these Editors, to have been thus inattentive in the case of Ephrem; as he is reported (*Lardner*, vol. ii. pp. 419, 420) to have written a commentary upon the *Harmony* of *Tatian*, a writer, whom the Unitarians have been at all times anxious (though most unfoundedly indeed) to claim as an auxiliary to their cause. (See *Williams's Free Inquiry*, pp. 60—66.)

I need not, I think, go much farther upon this subject.—I shall however touch briefly upon two or three points more.

The beginnings of the Gospels (at least of three of them) have always been found sadly troublesome to Unitarians. Matthew and Luke, however, have now been forced to part with theirs. This could not be so easily effected with regard to St. John. We have no *Ebionite* or *Marcion* appropriate to his use. But we have what answers just as well, a Unitarian expositor. —For example. "The WORD was in the beginning, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was A GOD." The WORD then is found, not to be GOD, but only A GOD. But again, lest, as being A GOD, it might still by possibility be supposed, that the formation of the world has been ascribed to this WORD in the verse which follows, we are told that "all things were DONE by him; and without him was not any thing DONE, that was DONE. That is, says the note, "all things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ; i. e. by his authority,—the word γίνομαι never signifying to create."—Well; but then we come to the 10th verse, in which we find the words, Ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. This, to common readers, would indicate, that the *world was created* by this WORD. But as we have seen above, that πάντα ἐγένοντο must be rendered, "all things were DONE by him;" of course it must follow here, that "*the world* was DONE by him:" let these words mean what they may. No such thing after all. Our expositor tells us, that the only true rendering is, "the world was *enlightened* by him." And thus the whole matter of the Divinity of Christ, and his creation of the world, are cleared away from the introduction of St. John's Gospel. For it must be observed, that, in the opening clause, (*In the Beginning was the Word,*) nothing indicative of Christ's *pre-existence* is contained; inasmuch as the *beginning* here means simply (we are told) "the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ." The whole, then, as duly explained by these critics, stands thus: *Christ* (for so they admit THE WORD is to be understood) *was from the commencement of the ministry of Christ; and Christ withdrew to commune with God, and to receive instructions for his ministry; and Christ was a God.* For the excellent and

strictly classical reasons assigned for these improvements upon the common version, I refer to this profoundly learned work itself, pp. 199, 200. If the reader should not be altogether satisfied with those reasons, he will however be pleased to recollect that the Editors have given fair notice, that it was not their intention to condescend to the "minuteness of verbal criticism."

I shall content myself with one specimen more of the qualifications of the Editors for the work which they have undertaken. I have given one, as an example of their accuracy, in ascertaining the genuine text of Scripture; a second as an example of their precision in reference to historical dates; a third, as an example of their attention to the minutiæ of Ecclesiastical history; a fourth, as an example of their acumen, in detecting the precise signification of the original language; and this will serve as an example of the justness of their inferences on general principles of reasoning. Acts vii. 60, we find St. Stephen addressing his prayers to Jesus Christ,—"Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" and,—"Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." On these passages, our expositors favour us with the following just distinction and salutary caution. "This address of Stephen to Jesus, when he actually saw him, does not authorize us to offer prayers to him, NOW HE IS INVISIBLE:" and for farther explanation they refer to Mr. Lindsey, who states the matter thus. "Unquestionably Stephen addressed this prayer to the Lord Jesus. But this can be no precedent for directing prayer to him *unseen*, or addressing him as God, whom the blessed martyr declares he *saw with his eyes*, and calls him *the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God;* calls him the SON OF MAN, in that his highest state of exaltation."—*Apology*, &c., p. 129.—This reasoning is quite invincible, and contains in it a mine of valuable matter, which does not at first sight present itself. Jesus must, it is evident, be a *mere man*, or he could not have been seen by Stephen in bodily form, "standing on the right hand of God," nor have been called by him the Son of Man.—("Behold I see the

Heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.") He might then of course be worshipped and prayed to, whilst he was plainly *visible as a man*. But when he ceased to appear as a man, he ought no longer to be addressed in prayer. Or, perhaps, generally speaking, it is meant, that no being that is invisible can properly be an object of worship. How all the arguments which Popery has ever devised, in defence of *image worship*, fade and vanish, in comparison of the bright and overpowering evidence which this reasoning supplies!

By this time the reader must be sufficiently aware of the great value of this *Improved Version of the New Testament;* and it may accordingly be safely dismissed: more particularly as *Dr. Nares's* valuable *Remarks* render all farther criticism upon the work nearly superfluous. And yet, before I finally take my leave of it, I must do it the justice to say, that there are criticisms, the production of certain Unitarian commentators, which are too bold even for *its* adoption. Of this, one striking instance is to be found in the translation of Acts xx. 28, in which the Editors prefer the safer mode of evading the admission of our Lord's divinity, by reading Κυρίου instead of Θεοῦ, *Lord* instead of *God*. Mr. Wakefield, on the contrary, contends strenuously for Θεοῦ, and afterwards effects his escape from the consequence, by proposing two of the most extraordinary criticisms that were ever ventured by a Greek scholar. Τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, he renders, not *his own blood*, but, *his own son*, because, truly, a man's *son* may be said to be *his own blood;* and, therefore, the *son* of GOD may be expressed by GOD'S OWN BLOOD,—an expression which, had it been used of GOD THE FATHER by a *Trinitarian* in defence of *his* doctrine, would have subjected him to Mr. Wakefield's ineffable contempt. Mr. W. supplies also another mode of getting rid of the difficulty, (that is, the difficulty of acknowledging the divinity of our Lord,) viz. that of translating the words, "by the blood of his own," (supplying the word *Son*.)—This, observe, is the rendering of διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. So much for the most celebrated

scholar of the modern Unitarian school which England has produced.—The reader will be rewarded for his trouble in looking into *Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek Article*, pp. 418—428, on this passage. In truth, I refer most willingly to this work, as to one which will supply to the Scripture student some of the most valuable helps to the critical investigation of the Text of the New Testament, which can be derived from any modern publication.

ON THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

Having been led, in the foregoing observations, to advert to the rejection, by the Unitarian Editors, of the portion which follows the genealogy in the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, I deem it not unadvisable to offer here a few remarks upon the subject of those chapters, which, without going at length into the proof of their authenticity, will, I trust, be found sufficient to supply at once a satisfactory assurance on that head. Dr. Marsh, in his ninth lecture, observes, that if we turn to the second volume of *Griesbach's Symbolæ Criticæ*, we shall find a quotation from the *first* chapter of St Matthew's Gospel, and a reference to the *second*, made by *Celsus* the Epicurean philosopher, which quotation and reference are noted by *Origen*, who wrote in answer to Celsus. *Griesbach*, he adds, justly remarks, "Hinc patet duo priora Matthæi capita Celso nota fuisse." And, with no less justice on his own part, he deduces the following inference:—that if Celsus, who wrote his celebrated work against the Christians in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and consequently little more than an hundred years after St. Matthew himself wrote, yet found the first two chapters in *his* manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel, those chapters must either have been *original* parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, or they must have been added at a time so little antecedent to the age of Celsus, that a writer so inquisitive, so sagacious, and at the same time so inimical to Christianity, could not

have failed to *detect* the imposture. But that, in this case, he would not have quoted those chapters as parts of St. Matthew's Gospel. And consequently, that the truth must lie in the *other* part of the dilemma, namely, that those chapters are authentic.—*Course of Lectures*, Part ii. pp. 55, 56.

To this reasoning of the learned and able Professor nothing can be added, which will give greater force to his conclusion. In point of fact, however, it is important to observe, that we are not left to a single quotation from the *first*, and a single reference to the *second*, chapter of St. Matthew, for the proof that these two chapters were known to and admitted by Celsus. In truth, we find, from Origen's refutation of that author's charges against Christianity, that his references to those chapters were so numerous, as nearly to supply a perfect detail of the facts which *they* relate. See *Origen against Celsus*, pp. 108. 119. 125. 134. 139. 184. 189. 192. 208. The reader, who may dislike the trouble of referring to Origen's work for the proof of this, will probably acquiesce in the following recapitulation given by Lardner of the testimony borne by Celsus to the facts recorded in the first two chapters of St. Matthew.

"We learn from him," (Celsus,) "that Christ was born of a virgin in a small village of Judea, supposed to have been descended from the Jewish kings; that she was married to a carpenter; that for some while her husband was doubtful about her chastity; that Chaldeans, or other wise men from the East, came to Jerusalem soon after his nativity, to do him homage as King of the Jews, having been excited to that journey by the appearance of a star; that Herod, moved by jealousy, put to death many young children, hoping to kill Jesus with them; that by direction of an angel he was carried by his parents into Egypt for the preservation of his life; where, as Celsus insinuates, Jesus learned the charms practised in that country. He calls Jesus the Nazaræan man, or man of Nazareth, from the place where he was brought up

and chiefly resided before his appearance in a public character."—See *Lardner's Works*, vol. viii. pp. 10, 11. 19—22. 58, 59; and for a yet more particularised detail by Dr. Doddridge, see ibid. p. 63.

Now, what is this, but an abridgment of the history given by the Evangelist? Indeed, the testimony thus borne by Celsus is so irresistible, that its application is not denied even by those writers who most strenuously oppose themselves to the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. Thus, *Dr. Williams*, in his *Free Enquiry*, p. 49, when urging his objections strongly against those chapters, asserts, that "we have no *certain* references or allusions to them, *till* the days of Celsus the Epicurean, about the year 150 or later." That the reference made by Celsus to these chapters is *certain* and *undoubted*, is, then, plainly admitted. As to the *lateness* of that reference, the drawback thence arising will not be considered very formidable, when it is recollected, that the date of Celsus's work is not removed from that of St. Matthew's Gospel by more than one hundred years, nor from the death of St. John by more than fifty; and when, in addition to this, the remarks already quoted from Dr. Marsh are held in remembrance. But imaginary as this drawback is, yet cannot even this be conceded to Dr. Williams; the very reverse of his allegation being the truth. For we *do* find *certain* references to the first two chapters of St. Matthew *before* the date of Celsus's work.

In the first place, we find them numerous and decisive in the writings of *Justin Martyr:* so much so, indeed, as nearly to supply a recapitulation of all the facts related in those chapters; and in such language as clearly to prove, that from those chapters the information of the writer was principally derived. The very words also of St. Matthew are sometimes quoted with a precision so unequivocal as to determine the source of the quotations. Passages and phrases which occur in St. Matthew only, and applications of the prophecies of Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah, which are made by no other Evangelist, are adopted by Justin; and adopted by

him with a literal adherence to St. Matthew's text; and, what renders the demonstration perfect, with a literal adherence in those very citations from the Old Testament, in which St. Matthew has departed from the words both of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. (See *Just. Mart.* pp. 53, 54. 304—307, and the observations upon these parts of Justin, pp. 95—99 of this volume.) These references to St. Matthew are contained in Justin's *First Apology*, presented by him to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, in the beginning of his reign, and in his *Dialogue with Trypho;* both of which are supposed by the best commentators to have been written about the year 140. Thus we have travelled nearer to the age of the Apostles; and in truth we come nearer still, if we consider that Justin's testimony, though not published till the year 140, may fairly be carried back to the period at which he became a Christian; inasmuch as we must suppose him at that time well acquainted with the Christian Scriptures, which must in fact have been the means of his conversion; and consequently cannot easily imagine, that what was not then conceived to form a part of St. Matthew's Gospel, could be afterwards received by him as such. In this view of the case, the authority of Justin's testimony reaches backwards nearly to the year 130.

To a date equally early may be referred the testimony of the Composer, (or perhaps I might more properly say,) the Christianizer of the *Sibylline Oracles;* who, as Lardner justly observes, was manifestly acquainted with the first two chapters of St. Matthew. For a few extracts from this work, see pp. 99, 100, of this volume. The objection, that this collection, or at least a part of it, was the forgery of a Christian writer, instead of detracting from its value, supplies the very circumstance which renders it admissible as evidence in the cause; since otherwise, (were it, what it professes to be, strictly prophetical,) its similarity to any other written document could afford no proof of that document's previous existence. The only point, which it is important to establish, is the date to be assigned to this collection: and, that it ex-

isted from an early period of the second century, may be fairly deduced from the authorities collected by Lardner. Celsus makes the interpolation of these Oracles a subject of reproach against Christians. And Justin quotes them in matters relating to Christian doctrine. I shall not, however, dwell upon the testimony which these writings present; but proceed to that, which brings us back within the limits of the Apostolic age, and which offers itself with an authority not inferior to that of Apostolic origin:—I mean the testimony of *Ignatius*.

This Apostolic Father, who suffered martyrdom at Rome in the tenth of Trajan, that is, in the year 107, (see *Lardner*, vol. ii. p. 69,) we find, in his (genuine) Epistle to the Ephesians, plainly referring to the history of the Virgin Mary's miraculous conception of our Lord, and to the appearance of the star which so wonderfully announced his birth. (See *Patr. Apost.* vol. ii. pp. 38. 94. 110. 112. 114.) In the larger Epistle also, (ibid. part 4, p. 78,) we find an exact quotation of the passage in Matth. i. 23: on which, however, I will not lay particular stress, as the larger Epistles of this Father are, and not unjustly, suspected of interpolation, and therefore this quotation may possibly be of spurious origin. We have now travelled back within about forty years from the publication of St. Matthew's Gospel; and we have the testimony of a contemporary and associate of the Apostles, one who outlived the Apostle John but by six or seven years, who had received the teaching of the Apostles, who had been appointed by the Apostles themselves to the Bishopric of Antioch, the first and oldest Christian Church among the Gentiles; appointed to it within less than ten years from the date of St. Matthew's Gospel, (see *Lardner*, vol. ii. p. 66,) and who himself, like the Apostles, died a martyr to the truth of the religion which he professed. We have, then, in fact, what amounts to Apostolic testimony for the truth and authenticity of the disputed chapters of St. Matthew. Yet, strange to say, a deficiency in this very respect has been alleged as an objection against their authenticity.

It is urged by Dr. Williams, that the *silence* of the Apostolical Fathers supplies an argument of this nature. It is true, indeed, he does not here mean to include Ignatius, having made *his* testimony the subject of a distinct inquiry. He speaks only of the other Fathers; and, of these, he adds that, without which their silence could afford no semblance of an argument whatever; namely, that they "often cite and refer to other parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, and had frequent occasion, in their debates with Jewish unbelievers, to refer, also, to the first and second chapters, had they known or acknowledged them to be genuine." (*Free Enq.* p. 103.) And in another place (p. 93) he says, that, "as these Fathers frequently had occasion to speak of the family and birth of Christ, it is hardly credible, that none of them should have referred to those chapters, had they been extant, and acknowledged to be the composition of St. Matthew.

Now, the direct opposite of both the assertions herein contained is precisely the fact. For, in the first place, the references made by these Fathers to St. Matthew's Gospel are extremely few; and, in the next place, they are in no part of their writings engaged in any debate or discussion whatever on the subject of the birth of Christ: (both of which points shall be more particularly adverted to at the conclusion of these remarks.) So that, were any inference to be drawn from the silence of these Fathers upon the subjects contained in the first two chapters of St. Matthew, it should rather be, that on those subjects no controversies existed at that day, the facts related in those chapters being acquiesced in without dispute: this, I say, should be the natural inference, when we find the facts familiarly alluded to by the only one of the Apostolical Fathers whose subject led him to refer to them,—Ignatius; and again by Justin, who immediately succeeded the times of those Fathers, and who, in truth, wrote both his *First Apology* and his *Dialogue with Trypho* before the death of one of them, namely, Polycarp.

Many have been the occasions on which I have found myself compelled, in the course of these volumes, to protest

against the disingenuousness of Unitarian critics in their treatment of ancient authorities; but, perhaps, there is no one, against whom such a protest is more loudly demanded, than against the writer whose objections I have been engaged in noticing.—The forgoing observations, coupled with those which will be found subjoined to these remarks, will probably appear to most readers sufficient to substantiate this charge; and yet they supply but a small part of what might be adduced in its support. At the same time, it remains to be remarked, that, notwithstanding the strained exertions of this writer against the authenticity of the introductory chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, he affords but very imperfect aid to the Editors of the Unitarian Version; inasmuch as his arguments are principally directed against the genealogy, which they retain as genuine; and the proofs, by which he endeavours to overturn St. Matthew's relation of the circumstances attending the miraculous nativity of our Lord, are built upon the assumed genuineness of the history of the same event as given by St. Luke: so that, if Dr. Williams be right in his results, the Editors are wrong in theirs: wrong in retaining the genealogy of St. Matthew, and wrong in rejecting the first two chapters of St. Luke.

But to return to our immediate subject. We have seen that the testimony supporting the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew carries us back to the age of the Apostles. A farther confirmation is had from the Syriac Version, the date of which is justly referred to the same early age, and in which, as in every other Version of St. Matthew, (including the *Old Italic*, whose antiquity is also unquestioned,) those two chapters are found to exist. And, that evidence might not be wanting from any description of the early writers, we have the testimony of a *Hebrew* Christian, *Hegesippus;* who, as Eusebius informs us, was amongst the first successors of the Apostles; and who is described by Gobar, as Ἀρχαιός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστόλικος. In a fragment of this writer, we have a reference to part of the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew; from which Lardner pro-

nounces, that it "appears plainly, that this part of St. Matthew's Gospel was owned by this Hebrew Christian:" so that, he adds, "he must either have used our Greek Gospel, or, if he used only the Hebrew edition of St. Matthew, this history must have been in it in his time." (*Lard. Works*, vol. ii. p. 143.)

How, then, stands the evidence upon the whole? The Syriac Version, which is one of Apostolical antiquity, and the Old Italic, both contain the two chapters. Ignatius, the only Apostolical Father who had occasion to make reference to them, does so. The Sibylline oracles do the same. Justin Martyr does the same. Celsus, the bitter enemy of the Christian faith, does the same. Hegesippus, a Hebrew Christian, does the same. Irenæus, and all the Fathers who succeed him, it is admitted, on all hands, do the same. And the chapters are at this day found in every unmutilated manuscript and every Version of the Gospel of St. Matthew which is extant throughout the world. Thus we have one continued and unbroken series of testimony from the days of the Apostles to the present time; and, in opposition to this, we find only a vague report of the state of a Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, said to be received amongst an obscure and unrecognised description of Hebrew Christians, who are admitted, even by the very writers who claim the support of their authority, to have mutilated the copy which they possessed, by removing the genealogy.

I should not have dwelt so long upon a subject, which is at this day so fully ascertained as the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, did it not furnish a fair opportunity of exhibiting the species of evidence which Unitarian critics are capable of resisting, and the sort of arguments with which they do not scruple to resist it.

I have mentioned above, that the first two chapters of St. Matthew are found in all the unmutilated MSS. that are extant. To those, hitherto commonly known, a late discovery in the library of the University of Dublin enables me to add the testimony of one more, and that of considerable antiquity.

For this discovery the public is indebted to the great industry and accurate research of the Rev. Dr. Barret, Vice-Provost of Trinity College. This manuscript, which is a *codex rescriptus*, contains the Gospel of St. Matthew in the most ancient Greek character, of which a fac simile has been published by the University: and it has been satisfactorily shown by the learned Editor not to be of later date than the sixth century. In this MS. we find the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, with the exception of some parts wanting from mutilation: namely, the first sixteen verses of the first chapter, and from the seventh to the twelfth, and from the twentieth to the twenty-third, verse of the second chapter. —It is a circumstance worthy of observation, that Dr. Williams, speaking of this manuscript, of which he had received an account previous to its publication, observes, "no information concerning *our inquiry* can be derived from this manuscript." (*Free Enq.* p. xxi.) Now the course of the inquiry had been to discover MSS. that could justify the *rejection* of the first two chapters of St. Matthew, or, at least, of the genealogy. For that purpose, undoubtedly, this MS. could yield no information: but for that which ought to be the purpose of an inquirer, it affords full information; viz. information of the fact, that, at the date of the manuscript, the genealogy and the whole of the first two chapters of St. Matthew were deemed by its writer to be authentic, and were found as a genuine part of the Gospel in the MS. from which it was copied.

In support of what has been asserted (pp. 89, 90) concerning *Justin Martyr's* reference to St. Matthew's Gospel, the following remarks will probably be deemed satisfactory.

The quotation from Isaiah vii. 14, by *Justin Martyr*, is as follows: Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν· καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. (p. 53.) In another place (p. 223) this is quoted with some little variation, λήψεται being read for ἕξει, and there being added after υἱὸν,

the words, καὶ καλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ. Now St. Matthew, and he only of the writers of the New Testament, has quoted this prophecy. Both he and Justin quote it in the same application. Both quote it in the *third* person, instead of the *second* (*thou shalt call*), in which it is given by both the Hebrew and Septuagint of the Prophet; and, what is most remarkable, both annex the interpretation of *Emmanuel* in the very same words, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς, *God with us.* So that, upon the whole, there can be no reasonable doubt of Justin's having taken the quotation from St. Matthew; as well from their mutual agreement in general, as from their common departure from, and common addition to, the text of the prophet as it stands both in the Hebrew and the Greek.

Again, in p. 54, Justin relates the declaration of the Angel to the Virgin in the manner described both by St. Matthew and St. Luke; and, having, through the first part of it, used the expressions of both indifferently, he concludes with these words, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν; which last clause contains the very words of St. Matthew; words to be found in no other writer of the New Testament. Justin, moreover, to prove that he was giving a quotation from the Evangelists, adds, "as *they* have taught us, who have written the history of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ:" hereby clearly announcing, that he derived his information from more than one of the sacred historians, and therefore manifestly pointing out both St. Matthew and St. Luke, who only of the sacred historians had related the story of the angel's address to Mary. And yet, what is Dr. Williams's observation upon this passage of Justin?—"The words supposed to be here cited from St. Matthew are, *For he shall save his people from their sins.* This, however, is by no means certain; for all the other parts of the quotation are taken out of St. Luke, though in a manner somewhat disordered. These words, therefore, may be no more than a *loose citation*, by memory, from St. Luke, or a reference to some other pas-

sages of the same writer, see Acts iv. 12; x. 43. The *thought* occurs in a variety of places in the New Testament; so that we are not necessarily obliged to conclude that there is an allusion to St. Matthew, and to no other Evangelist." He adds also, in a note, that the "manner in which the writers of the New Testament make citations from the Old plainly shows that they often quoted from memory." (*Free Enq.* p. 98.)—Here is surely most extraordinary reasoning. The *very* words of St. Matthew, *to a letter*, are used by Justin. The same words are employed by no other writer of the New Testament: and yet there is reason to think that this precise repetition of St. Matthew is not a quotation from him, but rather a *loose citation* from St. Luke, who has not used any terms resembling them. And, because the *thought* occurs in various places of the New Testament, we are not obliged to conclude that there is an allusion to St. Matthew, who is the only writer that has used the *words*: and this too, although Justin tells us, that he quotes from the Evangelists, at the same time that it must be admitted, that no other than Matthew and Luke can be alluded to: the one of whom does not at all employ the words in question, and the other does most accurately.

Dr. Williams, indeed, in a note, adds, that "Justin also *seems* to allude to the Arabian Magi, Matth. ii. 11, in his dialogue with Trypho, p. 315, &c., but it may be only an allusion to a common tradition." (*Free Enq.* p. 98.)—Now the reader will be surprised to learn, that this *seeming* allusion to the passage in Matth. ii. 11, concerning the Arabian Magi, is almost an exact transcript of that part of St. Matthew's history, and in several places conveyed in the very words of St. Matthew. The Magi, speaking of the king, whose birth was signified by the appearance of the star, tell Herod in the precise terms of the Evangelist, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ: and having come to Bethlehem, and fallen down and worshipped the young child, they are described by Justin as bringing their gifts, in the very language of St. Matthew; προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν, καὶ λίβανον, καὶ σμύρ-

ναν: and again, being warned in a vision not to return to Herod, they are described by Justin, as returning into their own country by a different way, in almost the very words of the Evangelist likewise, δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. See Matth. ii. 2. 11, 12, and Justin, pp. 304, 305. 307; which last pages, indeed, whoever reads, will be instantly satisfied, that St. Matthew is scarcely out of the view of the writer in a single line. It is true, indeed, that it is not to this part of Justin that Dr. Williams has referred, when he has spoken of the *seeming* allusion to the Magi, but to p. 315. C. Colon. 1686: that is, to p. 330 of the edition here cited. But why did not Dr. Williams take care to inform himself of what Justin did say, before he ventured to pronounce what he did not say? More, however, yet remains. We find in this history, as given by Justin, two prophecies applied, which are applied by none else than St. Matthew; and we find, also, that these prophecies are cited in the words of St. Matthew, and not in those of the prophets by whom they were delivered. What can be proof, if this be not?—1. In like manner as in St. Matthew, we there find Herod, when alarmed by the report of the wise men, consulting the scribes and elders; who inform him, that Christ was to be born in Bethlehem, for that the Prophet had said, Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου. See *Matt.* ii. 6, and *Justin*, pp. 55. 305. Now, in this citation of the prophecy, the Evangelist and the Martyr agree in every letter; whilst the prophecy itself, as given by the LXX, runs differently, thus; Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ μοι ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. *Alex.*—2. When describing the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, and the consequent fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy, *Justin* thus quotes the prophecy: Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ ἠκούσθη, κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολύς· Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσί. See *Justin*, p. 307, and *Matt.* ii. 18. Here, also, we have a complete agreement between Justin and St. Matthew, with this single

exception, that the words Θρῆνος καὶ, found in the common readings of St. Matthew, are here wanting. But it should be at the same time noted, that these words are likewise wanting in some manuscripts and many versions of St. Matthew; and that Griesbach marks them as most probably to be expunged from the text of the Evangelist. Now, on the other hand, how stands the prophecy itself, as rendered by the Seventy? Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ ἠκούσθη Θρήνου, καὶ κλαυθμοῦ, καὶ ὀδυρμοῦ, Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλαιομένης ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.—*Alex.*—or, as in *Vatic.* ἀποκλαιομένη οὐκ ἤθελε παύσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.—These remarkable passages in *Justin*, it must be observed, have been altogether unnoticed by Dr. Williams.—What then, upon the whole, is to be judged, concerning the likelihood of Justin's having quoted from St. Matthew, and concerning the accuracy of Dr. Williams's examination of this subject,—it cannot be necessary further to discuss.

At p. 90 of this volume, the *Sibylline Oracles* have been referred to. A few extracts from those oracles are here subjoined. In the eighth book are to be found several passages relating to the nativity of Christ. The angel Gabriel is there described, as visiting Mary the mother of our Lord, and foretelling the miraculous production of the Saviour: and the birth of this illustrious deliverer, at Bethlehem, of a virgin mother, is detailed at length. To this detail is added what follows.

Καινοφανὴς δὲ μάγοισι σεβάσθη θέσφατος ἀστήρ.
Σπαργανωθὲν δὲ βρέφος, δείχθη θεοπειθέσι φάτνῃ.
Καὶ λόγου ἡ Βεθλεὲμ πατρὶς θεόκλητος ἐλέχθη,
Βουτελάταις τε καὶ αἰγονόμοις καὶ ποιμέσιν ἀρνῶν.

p. 258.

In the same work also, in the first book, we find the incarnation of the Son of God; and the name, Ἰησοῦς, by which,

in his human form, he was to be known to men, thus described:—

Δὴ τότε καὶ μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ παῖς ἀνθρώποισιν
Ἥξει σαρκοφόρος, θνητοῖς ὁμοιούμενος ἐν γῆ.
Τέσσαρα φωνήεντα φέρει· τὰ δὲ ἄφωνα δύ' αὐτῷ.

Dr. Williams refers to both the above passages; and admits, that there are *many* which relate to the birth of Christ. Yet he contends, that they are *all* evidently taken from St. Luke's Gospel, one only excepted; namely, that one first cited above, which states, that "the wondrous new star that appeared was revered by the wise men:" and this he endeavours to explain away, as being derivable from the general tradition, and therefore not necessarily to be traced to St. Matthew's Gospel. (*Free Enq.* p. 97.)—Dr. Williams has, however, been rather unfortunate in the assertion, that every circumstance noticed in this work concerning the history of Christ, with the single exception just made, is taken from the Gospel of St. Luke. Had he examined the *Sibylline Oracles* for himself, and not contented himself with looking to the extracts given by Lardner, he would have discovered his assertion to be untenable; he would have found one passage, at least, alluding to a fact not recorded by St. Luke, nor by any Evangelist but St. Matthew, that of the preservation of the infant Jesus by the flight into Egypt.

τότε σῆμα βροτοῖσιν
Ἔσται ἐξαίφνης, ὁπόταν πεφυλαγμένος ἦξῃ
Ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτοιο καλὸς λίθος· ἐν δ' ἄρα τούτῳ
Λαὸς προσκόψει Ἑβραίων, ἔθνη δ' ἀγροῦνται
Αὐτοῦ ὑφηγήσει.

pp. 65, 66.

It has been asserted at p. 92, that "the references made by the *Apostolical Fathers* to St. Matthew's Gospel are extremely few;" and that (with an exception in the case of Ignatius) "these Fathers are, in no part of their writings,

engaged in any debate or discussion whatever on the subject of the *birth* of Christ." The truth of these positions will be manifest on a short review. The *Apostolical Fathers* are *five*, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Now, first, as to *St. Barnabas;* the greatest number of *possible* references made by this Father to St. Matthew's Gospel amounts to *eight:* and, in the opinion of Lardner, those, that may with any strength of probability he considered as such, do not exceed *four*, viz. Matth. xvi. 24; xx. 16; v. 42; ix. 13. And neither in these, nor in any allusion of this Father to any part of the New Testament, is there to be found any thing controversial respecting the birth or history of Christ. That the reader may satisfy himself as to this fact, I subjoin the several passages, to which, in addition to those above enumerated, St. Barnabas can be supposed to have referred. Matth. xxii. 43, 44; xxiv. 22; xxv. 5, 6. 10; xxvi. 31; Luke vi. 30; Acts x. 42; Rom. iv. 3; v. 16; ix. 10, 11, 12; xi. 36; xv. 8; 1 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 20; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 2; v. 16, 17; Phil. iv. 5; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. iii. 5; x. 25; 1 Pet. i. 17; ii. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. xxii. 12.

2. As to *St. Clement.* In the Epistle, which, as Bishop of Rome, he addressed to the Church of Corinth, we find but *four* references to the Gospel of St. Matthew: viz. vii. 1, 2. 12; ix. 42; xviii. 6; xxvi. 24. And neither in these, nor in any allusions to other parts of the New Testament, do we meet with any matter connected with the history of the birth of Christ, or relating to any object but that of moral and religious improvement, and the enforcement of Christian rules of conduct. The passages supposed to be alluded to by this Father are, in addition to those already specified, these which follow:—Luke vi. 36, 37, 38; xvii. 2; Acts xiii. 22; xx. 35; Rom. i. 29, 30. 32; ii. 20; ix. 4, 5; xiv. 1. 3; xv. 1; 1 Cor. i. 12; x. 24; xii. 12. 15. 22. 24; xiii. 4; xv. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 5; x. 17, 18; xi. 24, 25; Gal. i. 4; Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6; Phil. i. 10; ii. 5, 6, 7; Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. v. 18. 23; 1 Tim. ii. 8; iii. 13; v. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 1;

Heb. i. 3, 4, 5. 7. 13; iii. 2. 5; iv. 12; vi. 18; xi. 5. 7, 8. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. 39; xii. 1, 2. 6. 9, 10, 11; James i. 5, 6, 7, 8; ii. 21. 23; iii. 13; iv. 3, 4. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 8; v. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 5, 6, 7. 9; iii. 4.

[This Father's allusion to one of the above passages, Gal. i. 4, I insert here, though not connected with the present subject, as throwing a strong light upon the sense, which, in those apostolic days, was assigned to the phrase, *giving himself* FOR *us*, as applied to the sacrifice of Christ. Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.—*Patr. Apost.* vol. i. pp. 189, 190.—*Through the love which he had for us, Jesus Christ our Lord, by the will of God, gave his blood for us: his flesh for our flesh, his soul for our soul.* The reader will please to carry this exposition of the passage of Galatians i. 4 back to p. 162 of vol. i., where the substitutive force of the word ὑπὲρ has been already considered.]

3. In the *Shepherd of Hermas* we meet with allusions (most of them remote) to *ten* passages of St. Matthew at the most: viz. Matt. v. 28. 42; x. 32, 33; xiii. 5, 6, 7. 20, 21, 22. 31, 32; xviii. 3, 4; xix. 23, 24; xxiii. 6; xxviii. 18. The other parts of the New Testament to which this Father may be supposed to allude, are the following:—Mark ix. 50; Luke xiii. 24, 25; xvi. 18; John xiv. 6; Acts v. 41; Rom. viii. 11; ix. 4; xi. 29; xv. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vii. 11. 15; 2 Cor. vii. 10; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 4. 30, 31; Philip. iv. 18; Col. i. 15, 16; 1 Thess. v. 13; 2 Tim. i. 14; iv. 18; Heb. xii. 17; James i. 5; ii. 7; iii. 15. 17; iv. 2, 3, 4. 7. 12; v. 1, 2. 4; 1 Pet. i. 6, 7; iii. 15; v. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 15. 20; 1 John ii. 27; iv. 6; v. 6; 2 John 4; 3 John 3, 4; Jude 21. 24. There are expressions also in this Father resembling several in the book of Revelation. But in none of these allusions to the books of the New Testament, do we find the author concerned with any other than topics of moral and religious exhortation.

4. In those *Epistles of Ignatius* which are received as

genuine, there are to be discovered, besides the allusions to the first two chapters of St. Matthew noticed at p. 91 of this volume, but *six* passages of that Evangelist to which this Father can be supposed to refer: viz. iii. 15; x. 16; xii. 33; xviii. 19, 20; xix. 12. In addition to these, he may be considered as referring to the following parts of the other Gospels and of the Epistles: Luke xiv. 27; John iii. 8; viii. 29; x. 9; xii. 49; xvi. 11. 28; Acts x. 41; Rom. viii. 38, 39; xv. 7; 1 Cor. i. 10. 18, 19, 20; iv. 4; v. 7; vi. 9, 10; xv. 8; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. i. 1; v. 4; Eph. ii. 22; iv. 3, 4, 5; v. 2. 25. 29; vi. 13, 14. 16, 17; Philip. i. 21; ii. 3. 5; Col. i. 7; 1 Thess. v. 17; 2 Tim. i. 16. 18; ii. 4; Tit. ii. 3; Philem. 20; Heb. x. 28, 29; xiii. 9; 1 Pet. v. 5; 1 John i. 2; 3 John 2. Of these, as of the passages of the New Testament alluded to by the Fathers before named, it is to be remarked, that none are connected with any discussion concerning the nativity of our Lord. And the allusions, which this Father (as observed at p. 91) *has* made to that subject, will be found, upon examination, not to have been studiously and formally brought forward for the purpose of *proving* the miraculous circumstances of our Lord's birth, as if they were at that time not generally assented to; but introduced familiarly and unqualifiedly, as relating to a fact well known, and about which no difference of opinion prevailed, or at least none that demanded a more detailed consideration.

Lastly, with respect to *Polycarp*, of whose writings the *Epistle to the Philippians* is the only one that has been preserved; his references to St. Matthew are as follow: Matt. v. 3. 7. 10. 44; vi. 12, 13, 14, 15; vii. 1, 2; xxvi. 41. These relate merely to matter of religious exhortation and enforcement, as do his remaining references to other parts of the New Testament; namely, Acts ii. 24; Rom. xii. 17; xiii. 9, 10; xiv. 10. 12; 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 2. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iv. 14; vi. 7; viii. 21; Gal. i. 1; iv. 26; vi. 7; Ephes. ii. 8, 9; iv. 26; Philip. ii. 10, 11. 16; Col. i. 28; 1 Thess. v. 17. 22; 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2; vi. 7. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12; iv. 10;

Heb. iv. 12, 13; 1 Pet. i. 8. 13. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12. 17. 22. 24; iii. 9. 14; iv. 5. 7; v. 5; 1 John ii. 7; iv. 3; Jude 3.

The purposes, for which the Apostolical Fathers referred to the New Testament, will readily be discerned by a review of the passages to which they can be supposed to have alluded, and which have been here very fully enumerated. In truth, so far are they from having had occasion to refer to such parts of Scripture as relate to the family and birth of Christ, that, with the exception of Ignatius, their subjects in no instance lead them to any discussion, or even notice, of these points. The Epistle of Barnabas consists of two parts: the one exhorting to constancy in the belief and profession of the Christian doctrine *without the rites of the Jewish law;* and the other containing a course of Moral instructions. (See *Menard. Judic. de S. Barn. Patr. Apost.* vol. i. p. xxviii.) The Epistle of Clement is designed to compose dissensions, which had sprung up in the church of Corinth respecting spiritual governors; and is principally occupied in recommending peace, and harmony, and humility, and faith, and all the virtues of a Christian life. The writings of Hermas consist of visions, mandates, and similitudes, all totally unconnected with the person and history of Christ. The short letter of Polycarp, which is scarcely of sufficient bulk to fill ten octavo pages, is entirely employed in godly exhortation. And in the genuine Epistles of Ignatius, in which heretical opinions are adverted to, we find that Father opposing to those opinions the fact of our Lord's miraculous birth, agreeably to the account given of it by St. Matthew; and opposing that fact as decisive and unanswerable in argument, whilst it is itself assumed as a matter about which there was no dispute. That the heretical opinions, moreover, against which he had to contend, were not those which maintained the simple humanity of Christ, but those, on the contrary, which denied his human nature altogether, and the *reality* of his suffering and resurrection, seems fairly deducible from the entire tenor and language of his Epistles,

and more especially from the 11th section of his Epistle to the Magnesians, in which he lays particular stress on these things having been *done truly and certainly*, πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως [a].

How little, then, upon the whole, these early Fathers had to do with establishing the truth of the history relating to "the family and birth of Christ;" how little they were, in their writings, concerned in "debates with Jewish *unbelievers;*" how little they were urged to the necessity of "referring to the first two chapters of St. Matthew," and how little, consequently, Dr. Williams is at liberty to infer from the silence, which he attributes to them on the subject matter of those chapters, the conclusion that they are spurious, —I leave to the reader to determine.

That he may form the better judgment of the value of the argument derived from the silence of the Apostolical Fathers concerning any assigned portion of Scripture, I shall conclude with transcribing some observations of the industrious and cautious Lardner, upon the subject of their writings. (*Works*, vol. ii. pp. 103, 104.)—"All these are but short pieces. The largest is the Shepherd of Hermas, which is almost as large as all the rest put together. But it was inconsistent with the nature of that work for the writer to *quote* books. All these pieces, except the Shepherd of Hermas, are *epistles* written to *Christians;* who, it is likely, needed not at that time to be particularly informed what books they ought to receive; but only to be admonished to attend to the things contained in them, and to maintain their respect for them, as is here often done." From these and other particulars, he proceeds to say,—"it is apparent, that these Apostolical Fathers have not omitted to take notice of any book

[a] On the subject of the above paragraph, I cannot forbear recommending to the reader an excellent work of the late Mr. Wilson, of St. John's College, Cambridge, on the *Method of Explaining the New Testament by the early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ.* Let him look particularly to p. 357, and the argument connected therewith. I cannot but think that this ingenious writer has taken a juster view than that which even the learned Bishop Pearson, the great vindicator of Ignatius's writings, has formed, of the nature of the heresies with which this ancient Father had to contend.

of the New Testament, which, as far as we are able to judge, their design led them to mention. Their silence, therefore, about any other books, can be no prejudice to their genuineness, if we shall hereafter meet with credible testimonies to them." What has been here justly remarked respecting the books of Scripture, equally applies to portions of those books.

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

REMARKS ON THE UNITARIAN VERSION

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

In a former edition, I had been led to make some observations on the translation of the New Testament, which has been given to the public by the *Unitarians*, under the title of an Improved Version. To the version bearing this name, —a name, which, were it not known to be the serious appellation bestowed upon it by its authors, might well be suspected as the sarcastic designation of it by its opponents,— I stated a few objections; intended rather for the purpose of presenting some specimens of the unfitness and incapacity of the Editors, and of thereby guarding the unsuspicious and unreflecting reader against the imposing pretensions of the work, than for that of exhibiting in detail the errors, corruptions, and falsifications, with which it abounds; and which, in truth, render it a production, just as much fitted to convey a correct notion of the great doctrines of Christianity, as if it had been a translation of the chapters of the Koran.[a]

[a] I find in the *Brief Memorial* of that excellent and learned prelate, *Bishop Burgess*, the following observations and quotation, in which the story of Unitarian ingenuity in the management of Scripture is accurately paralleled:—"The Unitarian Version of the New Testament unites the two characters of *Marcion and Valentinus*. Alius *manu scripturas*, alius *sensus expositione* intervertit. Neque enim, si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim

The excellent treatise of *Dr. Nares*, (of which I rejoice to see a second and improved edition lately published,) together

exerte et palam machæra non stilo usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam cædem Scripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit; quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed ad scripturas materiam, excogitavit; et tamen plus abstulit, et plus adjecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum, et adjiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum. (*Tertull. De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 38.)"—The Bishop adds, "*Tertullian* calls the Valentinian New Testament a *travesty;—fabulam in totum aliam componi:* and such is the English Unitarian Version; as any one may see who will compare it with the original." (p. 32.) In truth the joint picture of *Marcion* and *Valentinus* admirably completes the Unitarian Editor; who, at the same time, it must be confessed, has wasted strength in his performance; since he has in his nature enough of *Marcion* to do without *Valentinus*, and enough of *Valentinus* to make him independent of *Marcion*.

At the moment of finishing the above paragraph, another valuable tract of *Bishop Burgess*, just published, has fallen into my hands, in which I find a passage of *Mosheim* so exactly applicable to the subject, that I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of adding it to this note. That writer, contrasting the *orthodox* interpreter, with the *Socinian* of *his* day, whose moderation is the scorn of the *Unitarian* of *ours*, says, "Nos simplicitatem unice consectamur; verba, ut usus hominum postulat, accipimus, nec aliter quam sana ratio jubet, interpretamur. Illi omnia contra: qui quidem universas ingenii vires intendunt, ut *vim dictorum sacrorum, multis variisque ambagibus, verborum contorsionibus, novis interpunctionibus, emendationibus denique, enervent, et a naturali sensu deflectant.* ITA QUI RATIONEM SEMPER NOBIS OBTRUDUNT, ID FACIUNT IPSI, QUOD RATIO FIERI POSSE NEGAT."—*Disert. ad Sanct. Discip.* p. 341.—See p. 72. of *The Bible and nothing but the Bible.*

To mention a single canon, of those laid down for the interpretation of Scripture by modern Unitarians, will abundantly justify the application to them of the observations of *Mosheim* upon their Socinian forerunners. "Impartial and sincere inquirers after truth must be particularly upon their guard against what is called the *natural signification* of words and phrases." (*Calm Inquiry*, pp. 4, 5.) By the "*natural signification* of words" is not here understood a signification of words established by *nature;* against which (as it is known not to exist) no person needs to be put upon his guard; but simply, that signification, which has been sanctioned by continued usage, by the true "jus et norma loquendi;" in other words, that signification, which a thorough knowledge of the language attributes to the words. This is the signification of words, against which the Unitarian, in the person of *Mr. Belsham*, the promulger of the above canon, would guard the reader and interpreter of Scripture; and this, on the ground, that the "connexion between words and ideas is perfectly arbitrary." The misfortune of a little knowledge is, that the phrases of a science are used without a perception of their import. *Locke* and other Metaphysicians have said, that the connexion between words and ideas is not a *natural* but an *arbitrary* connexion. And, in the sense in which they intend it, they have said truly;—namely, that sounds being indifferent in their nature, the signification of words must be the result of an *originally arbitrary imposition.* But the connexion of words and ideas being conventional, when once established, it is so far from being *arbitrary*, that nothing is more out of the power of individuals to alter. As *Locke* remarks, "even the great Augustus him-

with the valuable observations of *Dr. Laurence* and *Mr. Rennell*, had been successfully directed to the latter object. These writers, *Dr. Nares* especially, had detected and exposed many of the principal and most pernicious of the fallacies and blunders of this *Improved* Version. Some of the

self, in the possession of that power which ruled the world, acknowledged he could not make a new Latin word:" that is, says he, "he could not *arbitrarily* appoint what idea any sound should be a sign of, in the mouths and common language of his subjects." (*Essay*, b. iii. c. 2.)—Not so the Unitarian Metaphysicians. They have read somewhere, that "the connexion between words and ideas is arbitrary;" and mistaking the true meaning of the position, they are enabled, by their ignorance, to accomplish what Augustus could not by his power, to give arbitrarily to words whatever signification they may choose.

Mr. Belsham very properly follows up this canon, by another, which pronounces, that learning is by no means a necessary requisite for the just comprehension of Scripture—but that "a sound understanding and an honest mind" are fully sufficient for the purpose. The critical knowledge of a language can undoubtedly be of little use, where words have no established meaning. And the Editors of the Unitarian New Testament have, accordingly, acted with perfect consistency, in paying (as they openly avow) but little attention to "verbal criticism" in the execution of their translation. In fact, the grossest ignorance (and especially of the original language of the N. T.) is displayed by them and their assistant Commentators in every page of their compilations. This, indeed, seems at all times to have been a distinguishing characteristic of the Socinian School. The learned *Elsner* speaks of that Sect in the following language, which is surely not unappropiate to its followers of the present day:—"Ad confutandos adversarios, et *pestilentissimæ præsertim Socinianorum Sectæ* dogmata convellenda, præsentissimum auxilium fert *Græcæ linguæ peritia*. Summum horum hominum artificium in eo consistit, ut novas et insolentes notiones, quasque situs verborum plane respuit, vocibus subjiciant, loquutiones violenter divellant, omniaque misceant et turbent, ut aliquam saltem hæresi suæ veri speciem ex sacris libris inducant, *Græcæ enim linguæ fere expertes sunt.*—Sane ut *novam religionem* excogitarunt hi homines, cui postea accommodare sacros libros sunt conati, sic et *nova lingua* opus habent, qua omnes opinionis suæ errores eant confirmatum." *Observ. Sac.* præf. ad Lect.—It is with good reason that Mr. Belsham exclaims against a critical attention to the "niceties" of the Greek language, and against what he denominates "grammatical subtilties:"—this seems also not unseasonably inserted in the Introduction to his *Calm Inquiry*. Indeed this writer seems disposed to carry his ideas of the inutility of the knowledge of the *Greek* language for a just translation of the *Greek* Testament somewhat beyond the "*niceties*" and "grammatical *subtilties*" of the language: for he asks in triumph: "Who ever heard of a juryman being challenged, because he was not a *good grammarian?* Can no one know that Gustavus is banished from his throne, who is not able to read the instrument of his deposition in the *original language?*" (p. 6.)—After this, will any one pretend to say, that, for a perfect knowledge of the contents of the Old and New Testament, an acquaintance with the Hebrew and Greek languages, or a knowledge of the grammar of *any* language, is in any degree necessary?

periodical journals also, more particularly the *Quarterly* and *Eclectic* Reviews, had contributed their aid to the same salutary purpose. It, therefore, became the less necessary for me to carry my animadversions beyond the extent and the object to which I had proposed to confine myself.

The *Glasgow Religious Tract Society*, whose exertions in the dissemination of religious knowledge are highly meritorious, finding that uncommon efforts were making to spread Unitarian principles in Glasgow and its vicinity, and conceiving that the circulation of the *Remarks on the Unitarian Version* in a detached form, might assist in counteracting the threatened evil, applied in the year 1813 for my permission to publish them separately, as an extract from the work. To this I willingly assented: and that Society accordingly printed and circulated a large edition of the Extract, under the title of *An Exposure of the unwarrantable Liberties taken by the Unitarians with the Sacred Scriptures in their Version of the New Testament.* No sooner did this short tract make its appearance, than it was determined to assail it without mercy. It presented itself in a size and compass adapted to the Theologians of Hackney: and as, without much demand for literature, or much expenditure of thought, a pamphlet of about the same dimensions could be easily thrown off, in their usual popular style of dashing declamation and confident assertion; with a shew of learning and logic sufficient to disguise gross ignorance and rank sophistry; a mixture of pleasantry and sarcasm suited to the taste of those likely to become its readers; and, above all, with the note of triumph so uniformly and so ludicrously sounded by the modern writers of the Unitarian school, on every repetition of arguments which have been a thousand times refuted, and are yet as often advanced without the slightest notice of previous refutation:—such a thing was manufactured and sent abroad, for the total discomfiture of the author of the work on Atonement and Sacrifice, and, consequently, for the entire subversion of the doctrines which that work maintains. The pamphlet itself I did not consider entitled

to notice. But as its anonymous author, under the assumed appellation of the CALM INQUIRER[a], has charged me with unfair treatment of the Editors of the Unitarian Version, now that the sending out the present edition brings me again upon the subject, I shall not scruple to reconsider the objections which I have already advanced against that Version, and at the same time to bestow a few observations upon the vindication of the Version, which has been attempted by this *Calm Inquirer* in answer to those objections. This I am the more readily disposed to do, because (so far as I know) this pamphlet contains the only defence of the version that has been offered to the public in a detached form; and because the body of English Unitarians have attributed to it (trifling as it is) so high a value, that, not content with printing and circulating it at the expense of their public fund,

[a] The writer, although he entitles himself a "CALM INQUIRER," it should be observed, does not thereby *mean to announce* himself as the Author of the "CALM INQUIRY." And yet it seems somewhat whimsical, that *Mr. Belsham*, in his *Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley*, denominates the Author of the "CALM INQUIRY" continually by the title of the "CALM INQUIRER:" (*Month. Rep.* vol. viii. pp. 387. 452. 724, 725:) and this in the pages of the very volume in which the "ADDRESS" of the "CALM INQUIRER" is inserted.

The two things, however, are reconcilable. A person, entitling himself a *Calm Inquirer*, may yet not be the author of a *Calm Inquiry:* but he who has been the author of a *Calm Inquiry*, cannot be other than a *Calm Inquirer.* —*Dr. Nares*, in the new edition of his *Remarks*, (p. 248,) speaks, from what authority I know not, of the Author of this pamphlet being "said to be *Mr. Belsham* himself, the principal Editor of the Improved Version." *Dr. Wardlaw*, of Glasgow, also pronounces the "*Calm Inquirer* as generally understood to be *Mr. Belsham:*" and assigns as the ground of his own belief that it is so, the prevalence of the report, and likewise certain characters of internal evidence, arising from the calmness, the modesty, and the suavity, which he represents as markedly indicative of the style and manner of that writer. (*Discourses on the principal Points of the Socinian Controversy*, p. 431.)—Whether the conjectures of *Dr. Nares* and *Dr. Wardlaw* be well founded, I know not. I should have supposed *Mr. Belsham* to be possessed of more manliness than to *skulk* from an opponent: and whatever be the errors, absurdities, and vulgarities, of this little pamphlet conjecturally ascribed to him; be the deficiencies in reasoning, in knowledge, and in taste, what they may; I am satisfied, from *convincing proofs*, that the author of the *Review of Mr. Wilberforce*, the *Letters on Arianism*, the *Calm Inquiry*, and the *Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley*, has the *courage* to avow them all, if the production be truly his. Thus acquitted, then, of all connexion with this miserable little performance, as *Mr. Belsham* must *feel* himself to be, he of course will not be affected by any observations that may be occasionally bestowed upon it in the course of the ensuing remarks.

they have superadded the publication of it in their Magazine, thus securing to it every degree of currency and credit, that it is in the power of the entire body to bestow. Recognised and adopted in this manner by the whole community of Unitarians, (who appear now to be consolidated and organised in a manner somewhat approaching the system of the Wesleyan Methodists,) it is, of course, to be viewed as their own authenticated and deliberate defence of their version; at least so far as the objections advanced in a late edition of this work are concerned. We are therefore in no danger of mistaking the sense in which the Unitarian editors wish to be understood upon the points at issue: and, with the lights and explanations now afforded, we can be at no loss, in the revision of our former arguments, to know how far they apply to what, on the fullest consideration, the Unitarians themselves admit to be their meaning.

The charges advanced by me in a former edition were prefaced by one or two observations on the disingenuousness of the Editors of the new Version, in their use of the name of *Archbishop Newcome:* professing to ground their Version upon the basis of his translation, whilst in truth they adopt no part of it that interfered with their peculiar opinions: and thereby securing a respectable name for their Unitarian blasphemies, and contriving to circulate their poisons under a false label. Both the language and the matter of this charge have given great offence. I cannot depart from either. As to the former, deeming the opinions held by modern Unitarians to be *blasphemous*[a] and *pestilential*, I cannot in truth and justice denominate them by any other terms: and, as to the latter, being satisfied, that the charge of *deception* and *falsehood* in the *pretended* adherence to the Archbishop's

[a] Perhaps, indeed, the term "*blasphemy*," which has been that adopted by the *Laws of the Land* in speaking of the Socinian or Unitarian tenets, it may be thought by the Unitarians that no person has now a right to employ; as the *Laws against blasphemy* have been lately repealed by the Legislature. On the subject of this Repeal, the BRIEF MEMORIAL of *Bishop Burgess*, that watchful, and able, and learned guardian of the interests of true religion and of the Established Church, deserves the most serious consideration from all to whom those interests are dear.

translation, is founded in fact, I hold myself bound to make it good; and shall, for this purpose, more particularly bring before the reader's view the language and the conduct of the Editors in reference to this subject.

They inform us, (Introd. p. iv,) that they had adopted Archbishop Newcome's translation as the basis of their own, "not only because of its general accuracy, simplicity, and fidelity; but principally because he professes to have followed the text of *Griesbach's* edition," on the accuracy of which they largely descant. They state, also, that "they assumed it as a principle, that no alteration should be made in the Primate's translation but where it appeared to be *necessary* to the correction of error or inaccuracy, in the text, the language, the construction, or the sense." The *Calm* defender of the Editors adds, that they "could not without the most flagrant violation of honour and honesty have published their work without the most open and explicit acknowledgment of the use which they had thus made of the translation of the learned Primate." (*Address*, &c., p. 6.) But if "honour and honesty" demanded *so* "open an acknowledgment of the use which they had made of the Primate's translation," was there not some little matter of "honour and honesty" concerned likewise in making *as* open an acknowledgment of the use they *did not* make of that translation? Was it from a principle of justice to the Primate, that they first announced his translation as their model, and then departed from it whenever it suited their convenience: that they abide by the Primate just so long as he abides by them; following him in all matters that are perfectly indifferent, but utterly disregarding him in all those in which their peculiar opinions are concerned; until at length, even by the confession of their Vindicator himself, nearly *one tenth*[a] of this new Version is

[a] *Address by a Calm Inquirer*, &c., p. 6. "More than nine tenths of the Improved Version is the Primate's own."—What this writer exactly means by these words, it is not very easy to understand. Whether it be, that *nine tenths* of the *words taken numerically* are the same, or that *nine tenths* of the *sentences* agree, I am at a loss to determine. In the first case, since the distinct sentences of the N. T. contain, one with another, more than ten words

found to differ from that which it professes to follow? So that a translation, which they adopted as their basis, from "its general *accuracy, simplicity, and fidelity*," and from its adherence to the *correct text of Griesbach*, they find it "*necessary*" to depart from, by their own confession, to the amount of the ONE TENTH, on account of what they deem "*error* or *inaccuracy*, in the *text*, the *language*, the *construction*, or the *sense*." And this they call making one translation the *basis* of the other: and this entitles them, nay compels them, under the imperious demand of "honour and honesty," to spread the name of ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME[a]

each, it is manifest, that, by a proper distribution of the differing words, the two translations might possibly disagree in every sentence, and so become repugnant in their sense throughout.—In the second it is allowed, that, in one sentence in every ten, the two versions may be at variance, and consequently that they may differ in *every* passage affecting the *doctrines* of Christianity; since these would clearly not extend to the tenth part of the N. T. estimated by its component sentences. How absurd, then, and fallacious is it, under either acceptation of the words, to pretend to speak of the *Primate's* Version as *any* basis or standard whatsoever!—It must be observed, too, that the admission of this great extent of departure from the pretended model was not made, until, after a laborious research for the very purpose of the discovery, it had been shewn to the public that nearly one thousand variations from the text of the *Primate* have taken place. On this point I refer the reader to *Dr. Nares's Remarks*, (2d. edit. p. 3,) where it is stated, that even by a Unitarian Reviewer there had been reckoned up 750 deviations from *Newcome, in addition* to those "from the received text, and from *Griesbach's* second edition (not duly noticed or pointed out to the reader as they ought to be):" and that the same Unitarian writer *regrets*, "that *no* standard text had been adhered to, 'because' (says he) '*it would do away one of the most powerful charges brought against us, namely,* THAT WE ALTER THE SCRIPTURES TO SUIT OUR OWN SYSTEM.'"

[a] *Dr. Nares* very justly observes, that, whilst Archbishop Newcome's name is held out as a model in the title-page, the Editors expressly inform us, (in a note, however, not quite so prominent as the title-page,) that nothing but the clear and discriminating light diffused over the obscurities of the Sacred Scriptures by the venerable *Theophilus Lindsey*, and his coadjutors, *Jebb, Priestley, Wakefield*, and others, could *purify the Christian Religion from those numerous and enormous corruptions, which have so long disfigured its doctrines and impaired its progress.* "This," he adds, "is speaking out plainly, though it rather surprises me, that none of these names appear in the title-page to recommend the book, while *two* Archbishops are selected for this purpose: for, besides the learned *Primate* of Ireland, a motto is adopted from *Archbishop* Parker's preface to the *Bishops'* Bible, by way, surely, of a second decoy to the unwary members of the Church," (*Remarks*, &c., p. 2.)—The *Calm Inquirer* indeed observes, (p. 6,) that "the Editors of the Improved Version are not idolaters of Archbishops as such:" and from this he would have it inferred, that the

in large characters over the title-page of their book: and to impress the reader with the belief, that he is, in substance at least, perusing the *Primate's New Testament*, when he is perusing one purposely contrived to empty it of every doctrine which the *Primate* deemed essential to Christianity.

Well, but then we are told, that "*wherever* they have judged it expedient to deviate from the Primate's translation, the Editors have, *with the most scrupulous fidelity*, given notice of the change, and *set down the Primate's words in the margin*." So the *Calm Inquirer* positively asserts. (p. 6.) The Editors also state the same for themselves; and affirm that not only where they have deviated from the *Primate's Version*, but also where they have deviated from the *Received Text*, they have "in every instance" noticed the alteration at the foot of the page. (Introd. p. iv.) Now, although this by no means clears the Editors from imputation, for the reasons already alleged, yet upon this point I readily join issue with both them and their Vindicator. The *reverse* of the affirmation so peremptorily made by both, is notoriously the fact; and a fact which presents itself in such a form, that, although the compilers of this new version are entitled to take credit for much of precipitancy and carelessness on many points, yet they cannot be allowed to claim the unqualified benefit of that excuse upon this. Of the numerous examples which

charge of the intention of "sheltering themselves under the name of Primate Newcome" is totally unfounded. But this gentleman will please to recollect, that it was not to any extraordinary reverence for *Archbishops*, but to the gainful use which might be made of their authority, that their fondness for the *name* of Primate Newcome had been ascribed. It had been said, and with how much truth he who examines the work carefully may judge for himself, that the assumption of the name of a respected prelate of the Church of England for the sanction of a work, in which every doctrine professed by that Church, and by that respected member of it, is directly attacked, is something more than an artifice; that it is a falsehood and a fraud, and can have no other object than that of procuring a circulation by drawing in unsuspecting purchasers.—But to return to the title-page:—there we find, in large characters, IMPROVED VERSION, ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S TRANSLATION, CORRECTED TEXT.—*Archbishop Parker*, and the *Bishops' Bible*, are also made to meet the eye:—and all is executed by a SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. — The advocates of *Materialism* and *Necessity* were too strongly impressed with the power of *association*, not to have been aware of the great value of a good *primâ facie* adjustment.

might be cited in support of the assertion here made, I shall adduce a few, which will abundantly suffice to shew what degree of reliance is to be placed on the accuracy of these Unitarian Editors; and which, as vitally affecting some of the great doctrines of Christianity, will clearly manifest how far "honour and honesty" have been followed, in "making open acknowledgment" of *every departure* from the Version professed to be held in constant view.

I. Luke i. 35.—*Newcome*—"Therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee, shall be called THE Son of God."—*Imp. Vers.*—"Therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee shall be called A Son of God."

II. John i. 12.—*N.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave POWER TO BECOME children of God.—*I. V.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave AUTHORITY TO BE THE children of God."

III. John iii. 13.—*N.*—"Now no man GOETH up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, who WAS in heaven."—*I. V.*—"Now no man HATH ASCENDED up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man [who IS in heaven]."

IV. Rom. ix. 5.—*N.*—"Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom, AS CONCERNING THE FLESH, Christ *came*, WHO IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED for ever, AMEN."—*I. V.*—"Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom, BY NATURAL DESCENT, Christ *came*, GOD, WHO IS OVER ALL, BE BLESSED for ever."

V. 2 Cor. viii. 9.—*N.*—"For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, THOUGH he was rich, yet for your sakes he BECAME POOR, that through his poverty ye might be rich."—*I. V.*—"For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that WHILE he was rich, yet for your sakes he LIVED IN POVERTY, that through his poverty ye might be rich."

VI. Hebr. xii. 25, 26.—*N.*—"See that ye refuse not HIM who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him THAT uttered THE ORACLES OF GOD on earth, much MORE we *shall NOT escape*, if we reject him WHO WAS from heaven:

whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised," &c.—*I. V.*—"See that ye refuse not GOD who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him WHEN HE uttered ORACLES on earth, much LESS *shall* we *escape*, if we reject him SPEAKING from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised," &c.

Now, are these specimens, which are but a very few out of the number that might be adduced of *important, unacknowledged*, departures from Newcome's Version, to be accounted for from mere *accident?* If so, undoubtedly the Editors, in this their heedless innocency, have been wonderfully fortunate in stumbling so opportunely on passages, in which the omission of acknowledgment turns out so peculiarly favourable to their predominant opinions; and on all of which, (excepting the first, which they are desirous to explode altogether as spurious,) they employ lengthened observations in the notes, for the very purpose of divesting them of all appearance of the meaning, which would necessarily result from the Primate's rendering, deliberately and *unacknowledgedly* rejected and altered by them.

Respecting the *first* of these texts, it is obvious to remark, that the difference between the two forms of expression, "THE Son of God," and "A Son of God," affects immediately the question respecting the nature of our Lord's sonship: the great object with the Unitarians being to represent it in such a light as would admit human beings to be described as standing in the like relation to God. "All Christians," *Mr. Belsham* tells us in his *Calm Inquiry*, (p. 262,) "are children of God, being the heirs and expectants of a resurrection to a happy and immortal life." The Editors also take care to inform us, in their note on Rom. i. 4, that "Christ is called the Son of God for two reasons: first, because this title is equivalent to that of Messiah, and was so understood by the Jews, John i. 50:" and, "secondly, he is called[a] a Son of God, as having been raised from the dead

[a] There is something strikingly characteristic of Unitarian critics in this note on Rom. i. 4. They tell us, that "Christ is called THE 'Son of God'

to an immortal life;" that "in this sense Christ is called the first-born, having been the first human being who was put

for two reasons:" and the *second of the two* explains to us why "he is called A Son of God."—Now do these critics really *so far* disregard "verbal criticism," as to reject all difference between the *definite* and *indefinite* forms; or are they willing so to confound them occasionally in ordinary use, as to prepare an excuse for a similar confusion where it may stand them in good stead; or do they mean that in the first of the two senses our Lord is to be called THE "Son of God," and in the second A "Son of God?"—But, in truth, to look after the *meaning* of such Critics is in most cases an idle pursuit. To exhibit their *want of meaning* may not, indeed, be an equally unprofitable occupation. And therefore I must detain the reader for a short while, in tracing out the consistency with which these translators execute their office in the application of the *definite* and *indefinite* forms; especially so far as the important designation of our Lord, above alluded to, is concerned.

In John xix. 7, they tell us, that the reason assigned by the Jews for demanding our Lord's execution, was, "because he made himself A *Son of God.*" And when in Luke xxii. 70, they give us our Lord's own confession, on which the Jews are said to ground this accusation, it is, that he made himself "THE *Son of God.*" So that, having been guilty of the crime of calling himself "THE *Son of God,*" he is condemned because he called himself "A *Son of God.*"—But, yet farther, they represent the Jews as putting our Lord to death, because he confessed himself to be "A Son of God;" that is, because he confessed himself to be *one* of that description of persons represented under the general appellation of "Sons of God;" one of those who were "heirs and expectants of a resurrection to a happy immortality," as the Author of the *Calm Inquiry,* (p. 262,) and the Editors, in the note on Rom. i. 4, explain the appellation. Now, will the Editors, and their *Calm Inquirer,* be good enough to point out what "*blasphemy*" there was in this declaration; or what was the law of the Jewish Code, by which our Lord was doomed to die for this sad transgression of professing himself *one of those* who were *believers in and expectants of* a happy immortality?—Oh, no, they answer, it is not in *this* sense of the expression, but in that which makes it equivalent with *Messiah,* (which they are pleased at another time to tell us is all that the phrase *Son of God* implies,) that condemnation is passed upon our Lord. Well, then, our Lord, in declaring that he was "A SON OF GOD," declared that he was A MESSIAH: and it was for this that he suffered. We must here again apply to the Editors, and to the *Calm Inquirer* who defends them, to inform us, *how many Messiahs* there were to be; or whether, if *but one* Messiah be spoken of in Scripture, "A *Son of God,*" as such, and therefore *each* of those *Sons of God* whom the Editors and the *Calm Inquirer* have described to us, was to be that *one Messiah.* If the latter be the meaning of these theologians, (as, from their never having, in their various learned publications, intimated any thing of a *plurality of Messiahs,* it may not be deemed too unreasonable to conjecture,) then, the only cause, why they have hitherto objected to the UNITY of the Athanasian Creed, *must be,* that the persons of the *Monad* have not been sufficiently multiplied for their taste. I beg pardon of my reader. It is scarcely possible to treat of the arguments of some writers without being forced to trifle.—But we may now see, in one plain instance, the degree of improvement which this *Improved* Version has attained: the translation first differing from itself, as we have pointed out in the

into possession of this glorious inheritance;" that "all believers, as heirs of the same inheritance, are also Sons of

former of these observations; and next differing more fatally from the meaning which it is intended to convey, as we have shown in the latter.

But no: it was the great accuracy of the translators. They were careful to abide by the *corrected Greek Text of Griesbach*, with which they are so delighted. And as the Greek article occurs in one place, and not in the other, of those to which we have referred, they have translated in the *definite* and the *indefinite* form accordingly. No, in truth, they abide by no such rule, nor by any rule whatever. They have, on the contrary, in the use of the *definite* and *indefinite* forms, taken such liberties (just as they do with *Griesbach's* text generally as well as *Newcome's*) as suited their convenience; rendering the *articled* noun frequently in the *indefinite* form, and as frequently giving the *definite* form to the *anarthrous*. Had they, indeed, adopted such a rule as is above alluded to, they would have adopted a wrong one; because, as has been well shown by those who understand the subject, the Greek article is not in every case necessarily to be rendered by the English definite, much less is the English indefinite to be always employed where the Greek article is wanting. The researches of the learned render it totally unnecessary to enter into this subject; and it may perhaps suffice to refer to the first two sentences of the book of Genesis, to show what effect the unqualified application of the above rule to the Septuagint Greek would produce on our English translation: for Θεὸς having the article prefixed in the first sentence, and the words πνεῦμα Θεοῦ being each destitute of the article in the second, we must then render thus, "In the beginning THE God created the heaven and the earth"—"and A spirit of A God moved upon the face of the waters." In nothing is the difference between the *Schoolboy* and the *Scholar* more remarkable, than in the qualification of general rules. To which class the Editors and their brother critics belong, whoever takes the pains of examining their criticisms will be at no loss to discover.

I have, however, already said, that they are not to be charged with an *adherence* to the rule alluded to. No; they at the same time admit the rule, and violate it without cause. They follow no system either in the conformity, or the departure: but everywhere, according as it answers their purpose, or even as it hits their fancy, they apply or reject it altogether at pleasure. That I do not state this too strongly, one or two instances may suffice to prove. In Luke iv. 9, the words of the devil addressed to our Lord, εἰ ὁ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, they translate, "If thou be A Son of God;" whilst the *very same* words, used by the *very same* Being, and under *all* the circumstances *precisely the same*, they translate, when they occur in Matthew iv. 36; and even again in the same Evangelist Luke, (iv. 3,) "If thou be THE Son of God." [And as if they were determined to be in *nothing* correct, in what they call a *corrected text*, they even make a distinction between these latter passages, printing the article in the last one as *belonging* to the Greek text, and in the two others as *not* belonging to it, but introduced by the Translator. What makes it more extraordinary, also, that they should have selected the indefinite form for the passage in Luke iv. 9 is, that in that passage the *article* is found in the Greek text in a vast variety of MSS.: insomuch that it has hitherto formed a part of the received text, and it is doubtful whether, notwithstanding Griesbach's rejection, it should not do so still.]—Again the same form of expression, with a difference affecting merely the tense and person of the verb, ἀληθῶς

God:" and that "these are the only senses in which the title, Son of God, is applied to Christ in the genuine apostolical

Θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ, ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν, occurring also in one and the same Evangelist, (Matt. xiv. 33, and xxvii. 54,) they translate differently, although in both departing from the received translation; in the former, "Truly thou art A Son of God;" and in the latter, "Truly this was A Son of A God."—[They imagined undoubtedly, that they were making the expression *heathenish enough* for the Centurion in this last passage. But had they been a little better acquainted with the writings of the Classics, they would have known, that, although *a God* was a familiar phrase with the ancients, *Son of a God* was a title to which they were perfect strangers: and that, consequently, the expression, being borrowed from the Jews, must have been applied in like manner as *they* applied it, and as they had just before applied it in the hearing of the Centurion; (see verse 40, where the Editors themselves translate "THE Son of God," although there is no article in the Greek;) or, to speak more correctly, the Centurion being convinced (by what he had beheld) of the truth of our Lord's assertions, declared his belief in that truth, by ascribing to him the title which he had claimed with his dying breath, and for claiming which he had been sentenced to die; and consequently used the phrase in the sense in which our Lord himself applied it, whatever sense that might be—"Truly this man must have been that which he called himself, THE SON OF GOD."—Besides, it still remains to be asked, what reason is there to presume, that the Centurion, who had been a resident in Judea, was not a devout man, and one who had been taught to look for the kingdom of the Messiah.] In the last two instances, we have had, under the very same form of Greek expression, the varieties of "A Son of God," and "A Son of A God." But we have still another mode of rendering, not only the same form of expression, but as applied in exactly the same circumstances with the latter of these two instances; namely, as uttered by the Centurion, who in the parallel passage of St. Mark (xv. 39) is made to exclaim, "Truly this was THE Son of A God." Here it must be admitted is sufficient variety. The *same* Greek words, uttered by persons similarly conditioned, and under circumstances, in one pair of instances exactly alike, and in another sufficiently so, are rendered by the Editors in three different ways, (in compliment partly to *Wakefield*, partly to *Campbell*, and partly to *themselves*,) "A Son of God,"—"A Son of A God,"—and "THE Son of A God;"—in short, in almost every way excepting that one in which they *should* have been rendered in compliment to *truth*.

I have dwelt too long upon the whimsical varieties, in which the Editors indulge in reference to the use of the article. But there is one application of their versatile canon, which I cannot but particularly notice. The words ἡμέρα κρίσεως occur without an article in six passages of the Greek Testament: in Matt. x. 15; xi. 22. 24; xii. 36; 2 Pet. ii. 9; iii. 7: the word ἡμέρα being in the dative case in some, and in the accusative in others. These words the Editors have thought it right (disregarding their favourite model, *Newcome*) to render in the indefinite form, "A day of judgment," in the first four passages; and in the definite form, "THE day of judgment," in the other two. What they mean by thus multiplying *days of judgment*, it is for them to explain. The *Remedial* system, perhaps, as (we have seen at pp. 30. 35, 36, of the second volume) *Mr. Belsham* chooses to call it; or the system of *purgatory*, by which name it is more generally understood, may tend to throw some light upon this matter; because the lengthened process which

writings."—Now, it is quite clear, that, in the passage of which we at present treat, the title is applied in a sense very dif-

that system demands, according to the showing of its advocates, must, in its various stages, demand various adjustments of the degrees of suffering, according to the degree to which the purgation has from time to time proceeded: and these may possibly by the Unitarian supporters of this doctrine be viewed as so many different sentences passed upon the moral agent, who is the subject of this purgative process; and the respective dates of these may be, consequently, considered as so many different days of sentence or judgment. "THE *day of Judgment*," as they are pleased to admit it to be in the 2d Epistle of St. Peter, they may perhaps be able to explain, as some one of these days more distinguished than the rest, and therefore so denominated κατ' ἐξοχήν: or, possibly, they may altogether disregard the emphasis given to it here, and also in 1 John iv. 17, (where alone the article is prefixed to the word ἡμέρα,) from the general contempt in which they hold the Epistles: the writers of which they have so often shown to be ignorant and uninformed. I know not, whether, upon the whole, I have explained the matter entirely in the way that the Editors and their coadjutors will approve. But this I cannot but think very extraordinary, that those who will not allow in strictness the conceivable existence of either *day of Judgment*, or *Son of God*, yet insist at some times upon multiplying both without limit.

The Editors and their associates complain, that orthodox writers are too prone to lay a stress upon the use of the article; and that their endeavours to build Christian doctrines on so slight a foundation is quite absurd · and on this account they are not sparing in their raillery against *Mr. Granville Sharp*, *Dr. Wordsworth*, *Bishop Burgess*, and *Bishop Middleton*. It appears, however, that these gentlemen, although they do not trouble themselves much in seeking after any very *critical* use of the article, yet contrive to make a very *convenient* use of it: and *they*, at least, are not backward, in building doctrines of the last moment upon the application of an *a*, or a *the*. How they contrive to *overturn* important doctrines by the dexterous management of these minute parts of speech, we have already seen. I shall now give a specimen of their mode of employing them to establish the tenets of their own system. *Dr. Carpenter*, one of their latest and most prominent writers, supplies us with a good instance to this purpose. He observes, upon John v. 27, that the article, which, in every other part of the Gospels, where the phrase "*Son of Man*" occurs, is prefixed to it in the Greek, is here wanting: and *therefore* he renders the words, "A Son of Man:" and says, that he is satisfied, "that by the remarkable words ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστι, our Lord is to be understood as declaring, that he *was appointed to his high office of Judge of all mankind*, BECAUSE HE IS a PROPER HUMAN BEING." (*Unit. the Doct.* &c., p. 109.) Now, certainly, that a person should be appointed to judge the whole world at the last day, simply, *because* that person was a human being, a human being properly and strictly such, seems as curious in point of reason, as that υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου must signify a mere man *because* the article is not prefixed, appears in point of grammar. What, upon the whole, does Dr. Carpenter acquaint us with here? He opens up two important truths:—one, that because our Lord in this place denominates himself υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and not ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, (which, by the way, he *everywhere else* calls himself, in not fewer than seventy passages, throughout the Gospels,) he must be merely and simply *man* in the common sense of the word: the other, that, from being simply man, he is properly qualified for

ferent from either of these. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow

the office of judging all mankind:—and, indeed, this peculiar fitness of a mere man for this office is viewed, by this writer, as an additional confirmation of his belief in the proper humanity of Christ.

Mr. Belsham, who likewise contends that this text in John "implies, that there is a peculiar propriety in delegating this office to a human being," (*Calm Inquiry*, p. 337,) yet seems in some degree to stumble at it; although, from the manner in which he recovers himself, it may appear as if he only wished to show with what a grace he could regain his upright position. For, after enumerating above twenty passages of the N. T. from which he admits it to be "concluded, that Jesus is appointed to appear in person to *raise the dead* to *judge the world*, and to *award to every individual of the human race his final sentence of reward or punishment;*" he proceeds to say, "This is an office of such transcendant dignity and importance, and requires powers so far superior to any thing which we can conceive to belong to a mere human being, however meritorious and exalted, that to many *it appears utterly incredible* that such an office should be assigned to one who was himself at one time A PECCABLE AND FALLIBLE MAN, and, as such, LIABLE TO APPEAR AT THE TRIBUNAL OF ETERNAL JUSTICE." And he adds, that "this argument has appeared so forcible to some persons of much learning and reflection, that *this consideration alone* has prevented them from acceding to the Unitarian hypothesis, though they have acknowledged that *particular texts might admit* of a satisfactory explanation upon Unitarian principles." Among these persons he specially notices "the late revered and learned *Hugh Farmer* of Walthamstow, *who thought that difficulties from particular texts* MIGHT *be overcome*," and who had, to the great delight of *Mr. Belsham*, gone so far as to consider "Tertullian's testimonies to the Unitarianism of the primitive Christians" unrebutted; yet even he, and others, who had travelled, it seems, very far with Unitarians, and were disposed to get rid of the difficulties which Scripture threw in their way, could never get rid of this. *Mr. Belsham* himself admits it to be "a great difficulty" indeed: but he adduces some considerations, by which, he says, "it may possibly be ALLEVIATED." The word "*alleviated*" naturally suggests the idea of great *distress*, under which it cannot be denied *Mr. Belsham* appears to labour not a little upon this point. However, after quoting a passage from *Dr. Priestley*, in which that writer endeavours to convince *Dr. Price* of this grand Unitarian tenet, by telling him that the power to judge the world might be *as easily* imparted by God, AS *the power of raising the dead*, (which very power, by the way, *Dr. Price* had, in a Sermon on the *Pre-existence and Dignity of Christ*, that completely overwhelms with confutation the Socinian hypothesis of our Lord's humanity, pronounced to be fully equivalent to the *power of creating a world*—*Sermons*, p. 148,) and by reminding him that our Lord's qualifications for discharging this office were not acquired *suddenly*, for that a long interval was to take place "between his ascension and his second coming, in which it cannot be supposed that he is *doing and learning nothing*:—Mr. Belsham, I say, after quoting this passage from *Dr. Priestley*, and making some other equally profound observations of his own, concludes, at length, in triumph, that the point is completely made out, that Christ is but "*figuratively a judge*, because the final states of all mankind will be awarded in a future life agreeably to the solemn, repeated, and explicit declarations of his Gospel." Thus we find all, *as usual*, settled in *figure*.

thee: THEREFORE" (not, observe, not because he was the "Messiah," nor because of his being "raised from the dead

And, to show how just this is here, *Mr. Belsham* reminds us, that the Unitarians have already established the fact, that the several capacities and offices ascribed to our Lord in Scripture belonged to him *only in figure:* that he is but FIGURATIVELY a *Lawgiver;* but FIGURATIVELY a *Priest;* but FIGURATIVELY a *King;* and, in like manner, but FIGURATIVELY a *Judge:*—that is, that being in fact, *neither* LAWGIVER, *nor* PRIEST, *nor* KING, *nor* JUDGE, he is called in Scripture by all these names, and described as doing the acts belonging to these several offices, merely from the love which the Sacred Writers have of speaking *in figure*, even at the risk of misleading almost the whole Christian world as to the reality.

I beg the reader's attention to all that *Mr. Belsham* has *revealed* to us upon this subject in his *Calm Inquiry*, from p. 332 to p. 342. And yet one great puzzle remains; for it will be remembered that this same CALM INQUIRER tells us, in the outset of his work, at p. 5, that the whole Inquiry concerning the person of Christ, "is into a *plain matter of fact*, which is to be determined like any other fact by its specific evidence, the evidence of PLAIN UNEQUIVOCAL *testimony*," (here are no "great difficulties" that require to be "*alleviated*,") "for judging of which, no other qualifications are requisite than a sound understanding and an honest mind." The great difficulty, however, that appears to grow out of this seeming contradiction, will be easily "*alleviated*" by Mr. Belsham's assuring us, that a "plain matter of fact" must mean a *puzzling matter of figure;* and that the "plain unequivocal testimony" of the Evangelists consisted in their *figurative and intricate involutions* of language, which none but Unitarians could develope, and which even they were not able to develope to some of their own *enlightened friends*, such as *Dr. Price* and *Mr. Farmer*, who were desirous of approaching them if they could.—And, as a proof of the great *plainness* of this whole matter, this extraordinary writer, who assigns *any thing* as a reason for *any thing*, goes on to say, "Who can believe that the decision of the great question, whether Jesus of Nazareth is the true God, and the Creator and Governor of the world, depends upon a critical knowledge of the niceties of the Greek article?"—Nobody, most undoubtedly, ever believed or even dreamt any such thing. At the same time, if real and profound Greek scholars have found the designative and emphatical force of the Greek article fall in with the great truth, which stands like a rock of demonstration on the base of the whole body of the Scriptures, how can the thing be helped? It cannot, indeed, but move contempt to see those, who are not conversant in the Greek language, employing their very ignorance for the subversion of that great truth; and endeavouring to derive, from an uncritical and unscholar-like application of the Greek article, an argument, whereby the great Creator and Governor of the world, *the Son of God*,—who had been with his Father before all worlds, and who condescended to come into the world as *the Son of Man* that he might redeem and judge the world,—should be degraded to the rank of mere man, fallible and peccable as any of those unhappy blasphemers of his majesty, who dare to pronounce him such. For a full and satisfactory explanation of the force of the phrase *Son of Man*, and especially in its application in John v. 27, and for the reason, why the Greek article is here omitted, which is found to accompany the title wherever else it occurs throughout the Gospels,—I refer to a Critic, who had well considered, and had taken pains thoroughly to understand the subject, before he submitted his opinions

to an immortal life," but simply *because of the mode of his human generation by the power of God; because of his being*

to the public, *Dr. Middleton.* (*Doctrine of the Greek Article*, pp. 351—354.) The title, *Son of Man*, he observes justly, "has everywhere a reference to the *Incarnation of Christ:*" —and he adds, that, generally, in the use of the appellation by our Lord, "the allusion is either to his present humiliation, or to his future glory:" and therefore, he concludes, we have in this phrase, "though an indirect, yet a strong and perpetual declaration, that the human nature did not originally belong to him, and was not properly his own."

In truth, the very use of the phrase seems almost inexplicable on the supposition, that our Lord was merely and properly a human being: for why call himself by a title emphatically denoting human origin, if *no other* origin could be ascribed to him: why, as *Mr. John Jones* says, (in a book which he pleasantly calls "ILLUSTRATIONS *of the Gospels*,") and says I really believe, with a *sincere* intention to *help* the Unitarian cause, why did our Lord, "appearing as man in the midst of men, and exposed to their wants and feelings," thus labour to "inculcate, WHAT NONE NEEDED TO LEARN, that he was a human being?" Not exactly for the reason assigned by this ingenious gentleman,—that "the Gnostic teachers denied his *humanity;* and rejected and blasphemed the Son of Man, the Man Jesus, while they affected to honour and embrace the God within him continually." There is one small chronological difficulty in the way of this solution; namely, that there were *no* Gnostic teachers whatever in existence to deny our Lord's humanity during the whole period of his ministry. But this writer has stumbled very near the truth. Our Lord, in the repeated and emphatical use of the title *Son of God*, had claimed to himself a *divine nature;* he was understood as doing so by the Jews, who charged him, on the repeated assumption of that title, with *making himself God*, and who finally sentenced him to death for that great offence against their law. Having therefore thus claimed to himself a *divine* nature, he was also, for the unfolding the whole truth as to the nature which he possessed, led to affirm the *human* nature which was united with the *divine* by his *Incarnation.* And as the one part had been expressed by the title SON OF GOD, so the other was naturally conveyed by the corresponding form of denomination, SON OF MAN. The Socinians and Unitarians are always willing to forget, that the establishing of the human nature of our Lord is as necessary to our scheme as to theirs; but, at the same time, they should remember, that our Lord's repeated assertion of it, and in the peculiar form of phrase in which it is conveyed, is utterly inexplicable on their system: so that they not only deny to our blessed Lord the appellation, which he claims, of *the Son of God;* but they render him in a great measure unintelligible, when he entitles himself *the Son of Man.*

To give the reader some relief, by passing from the regions of confidence and ignorance to those of a far different character, I shall subjoin the conclusions of a critic and a scholar, derived from a cautious and elaborate comparison of the applications of the phrases, *Son of God*, and *Son of Man*, throughout the entire range of the N. T. in the original language. *Schleusner*, to whom the Unitarian Editors and their associates profess a willingness to appeal on all occasions, (although they have excluded his valuable lexicon from their list of those that are useful for the New Testament,) thus sums up his explanations of those titles as applied to our Lord, under the article Υἱὸς.—"Καθ' ἐξοχὴν vero et longe sublimiori

incarnate by the Holy Ghost; because, in short, in the plain sense of the words, *God was his Father;* THEREFORE) "that

sensu, quam qui in ullam creaturam cadat, *Christus*—ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in N. T. vocatur, *ad rationem ejus erga Deum et sublimiorem illam naturam, quæ ante Jesum natum jam exstitit significandam.*" And, again, "Κατ' ἐξοχήν, in N. T. *Christus*, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου vocatur, *ratione scilicet humanæ naturæ, quam interventu divinæ virtutis induit.*" And, under the article "ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ, he expresses himself still more fully and emphatically on the latter designation; observing, that the word ἄνθρωπος is used as in relation to the *female* of our species, in all those passages, in which the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is applied to our Lord; being in strictness, as to his human nature, the Son of Mary; which *Schleusner* thinks, is expressed in the words γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς in Gal. iv. 4: and, in opposition to the opinion of *Less*, that this title was used by our Lord to express an abject and humiliated state, he adduces the passage in John v. 27, of which we have already spoken, to show, that on the contrary it was intended as a title of eminence, and as he says, "Ut vel hoc nomine edocerentur homines, Jesum esse promissum illum in V. T. Messiam et insignem doctorem divinum, (Ezek. i. 26; Dan. vii. 13, 14,) qui communi nascendi lege a Maria virgine, interveniente divinâ virtute, initia vitæ vere humanæ haberet, et *corpus indueret vere humanum*, ut, quod fuit sapientiæ divinæ decretum, homines per hominem adjuvarentur. Tantum igitur abest, ut hac formula vilissimus ille, ad quem Jesum descendisse fingunt haud pauci, servorum status describatur, ut potius, sive decreti divini sapientiam, sive origines Christi, *quas interventu divinæ virtutis cepit*, spectes, nihil hoc nomine sublimius, illustrius et magis honorificum fingi et cogitari possit."—The sort of use which the Unitarians contrive to make of the *name* of *Schleusner*, *Bishop Burgess* has, in his publication upon that subject, most admirably exposed. See *The Bible and nothing but the Bible*, &c., pp. 59—66. 74—96. 111—117.

One would hardly think, after reading the passages which have been here adduced from *Schleusner*, that any writer could have the hardihood to mention *his* name in connexion with the assertion, that our Lord was not called *the Son of God* in a sense implying any *peculiarity* of nature, or in any other than that of the common Jewish idiom, under which the title was equally applicable to believers at large. And yet this has been expressly done by *Dr. Carpenter*, who builds the whole of his Unitarian position touching this phrase, upon *Schleusner*, "whom" (he adds, to give his argument the greater effect) "no one can suspect of being an Unitarian." *Unit. the Doct.* &c., p. 174. —Thus is the unsuspecting reader deluded, and by those who scarcely ever have the words "truth" and "candour" out of their *mouths*. The very article Υἱὸς, too, from which I have adduced *Schleusner's* own words, is the very article to which reference is thus made, for the establishing by *Schleusner's name*, the direct contrary of *Schleusner's opinions*.

On the subject of this note, many excellent observations will be found in *Dr. Nares's Remarks*, 2d edit. pp. 54—60. Before I dismiss the subject, it is worth remarking, that, of the two titles, *Son of God* and *Son of Man*, applied to our Lord in the New Testament, each of them more than eighty times, the former is a title used familiarly of our Lord by all; but the latter is a name applied only by himself, excepting in Acts vii. 56, where he is said to be seen by St. Stephen in the heavens after his ascension; and in Heb. ii. 6, and Revel. i. 13; xiv. 14, the first of which is a quotation from the Psalms, and the other two refer, as the vision of

Holy Child also which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD."

In verse 32 also, just preceding, we find *Newcome* use the definite article, "He shall be great, and shall be called THE Son of the most High." And in this likewise the *followers* of Newcome *desert* him, rendering "A Son of the most High." and giving no notice whatever of the departure. This, however, we shall be told, is all accident: "a mere slip of the pen," or, perhaps, "an error of the press." But let it be remembered, that these *two* passages of St. Luke, in *each* of which the *two* accidents, the change of the Version, and the omission of the acknowledgment, have jumped together, are precisely those to which the Editors attach uncommon importance, as going directly and explicitly to the *personal nature* of our Lord. This is manifest, as well from the reasons, which, as we have seen, they have been compelled by their system to assign for the application of the title, SON of GOD; as from the great pains taken, by one [a] of them especially,

St. Stephen did, to that *exaltation in the heavens*, which, with our Lord's dying words he declared, awaited the *Son of Man*: so that, in truth, except when our Lord himself assumes it as an appellation, it is never used concerning him in the N. T., save only to establish the fact of his having ascended into heaven; which to mortal eye could have been represented only in his bodily form; in that form, in reference to which he had designated himself as the *Son of Man*.

[a] *Mr. Belsham*, who is always rich in matter that, in a research like the present, it is necessary to bring before the reader, has expressed himself upon this subject in such a manner, that I cannot avoid quoting the entire of his observations.—"It is announced by the Angel, Luke i. 35, that Jesus should be called 'the Son of God,' on account of his miraculous conception. But as it does not appear that he ever received that appellation from any one on that account, it being generally allowed that the fact, if true, was unknown during his personal ministry, this circumstance is rather an additional presumption against the truth of the narrative."—We see what slender reasons will satisfy some persons on the point of rejecting part of Holy Writ. Surely even a writer, who seems not to concern himself much with the productions of any but Unitarians; and who, like the rest of the writers of that description, appears to be for ever going round and round in the same circle, repeating again and again what has again and again wearied and disgusted; even he cannot be ignorant, that the phrase, *to be called*, is familiar with the Hebrew writers, as applying to the *nature* rather than to the *actual appellation* of the subject. Perhaps, indeed, he *may* imagine, that when St. Luke, in the very next verse to this, informs us, that Elizabeth "was *called* barren," the Evangelist means to say, that *Barren* was the actual name by which she was distinguished: or again, that when, in

(in a work intended as a Supplement to the Version, and published for the purpose of glossing over and defending its

chap. ii. 23, the same Evangelist tells us, from the Law, that "every male that openeth the womb, shall be *called* HOLY TO THE LORD," he intends to assert, that this was the true and proper appellation of every first born male of the species both of man and of beast. That this *may* be *Mr. Belsham's* idea, is not actually impossible; for things not less extravagant are to be found plentifully scattered throughout his pages. But surely, whether this be so or not, the criticism just quoted affords no very favourable specimen of the critic's acquaintance with the sacred writings. The instances that establish the existence of this Hebrew idiom (if indeed, strictly speaking, it can be called a *Hebrew* idiom, when the examples of κληθήσεται for ἔσται, as every scholar knows, are to be found abundantly in various writers,) are numerous, and perfectly familiar to all who have made the writings of the Old and New Testament their study. But those that I have cited, I have chosen to adduce from the same writer, (as being within the very portion of Scripture, that even by *Mr. Belsham* himself is admitted to come from the same person,) from whose hand we have the very passage at present under consideration. We see, then, that even though our Lord had never once been *called* "the Son of God," yet the declaration in this passage would have been nevertheless perfectly true: inasmuch as the meaning plainly is, that he *was, in his nature,* that which this appellation properly denoted.

However, to satisfy this critic, we will suppose that it *was* the *appellation* which was intended in this place by the words of the Angel. What follows? Why, then, he says, "It *does not appear* that he ever received *that appellation* from any one *on that account,*" (that is, on account of the miraculous conception,) and consequently he infers the narrative to be untrue. Now, if I understand this gentleman rightly, (which, indeed, I confess it is not always in my power to do,) he intends to say, that the declaration, that for a particular reason, a person shall be called by a certain name, cannot be verified, unless, when he *is* called by that name, there be assigned also the reason for which the appellation had been originally bestowed; and that, consequently, unless those by whom our Lord was denominated "the Son of God," took care to specify that he was *so* denominated *on account* of the miraculous conception recorded by St. Luke, the declaration in the 35th verse of the first chapter must be given up, as containing a falsehood. Now, in the 2d chap. of Genesis we are told, that the female of our species should be *called* WOMAN, *because she was taken out of man:* in the 17th chap. *Abram* is to be *called* ABRAHAM, *because he was to be a father of many nations:* in the 32d chap. again, *Jacob* is to be *called* ISRAEL, *because as a Prince he had power with God and with men, and had prevailed:* —and I should be glad to learn, where we find in Scripture the *reasons* for these names assigned by the speaker, when he employs the names. Are we then to reject these parts of Genesis, and the various other portions of Scripture in which the reasons for appellations given are assigned, because we do not find the statement of these reasons afterwards accompanying the use of the appellation? *Mr. Belsham,* who shows no great reluctance to part with *any* portion of Scripture, will most probably answer, Yes. Well, but, perhaps, we may be able to satisfy him after all, in the case before us, if he will not be too rigorous in demanding from us an instance of the repetition of the *very words* of the reason first assigned for the appellation. If we can show, that the term, *Son of God,* is applied to our

various corruptions and mistakes,) to remove altogether from the canon of Scripture this portion of St. Luke, as overturn-

Lord directly in reference to a *divine nature thereby attributed*, possibly he may admit *this* to satisfy his demands; since, in truth, the real cause of his quarrelling with the miraculous conception, is, (although he professes it to be otherwise,) because it goes to establish the *superhuman* nature of our Lord.

To come, then, to the point. When the Jews assign to Pilate the reason for which our Lord ought to die, what is the charge? Simply, that "he made himself the SON OF GOD." What, then, is the sense in which it is declared by the Jews, that our Lord assumed this appellation? Plainly, that of its implying, what the words directly import, and what upon two former occasions they had expressly pronounced them to import, the *divine nature* of our Lord." "We have a law," they say, "and by our law he ought to die, *because he made himself* THE SON OF GOD." (John, xix. 7.) Now, what that law was, is evident from the parallel passages in Matth. xxvi. 65, and Mark, xiv. 64, in which it is declared, that the crime which our Lord had committed, and for which he was to suffer death under the Law, was the crime of *blasphemy*. In calling himself THE SON OF GOD, he had been guilty of an assumption of the divine nature, which being, in the judgment of the Jews, blasphemy against the Most High, and overturning, as they conceived, the first principle of their religion, the Unity of God, they of course pronounced, that, according to their law, he ought to die. For this *blasphemy*, also, the Jews on two former occasions had sought to kill him, when he had merely spoken of himself as the SON OF GOD. John, v. 18; x. 33. In the first of these, we find the Jews declaring, as the reason why he should be put to death, that he had said, "that God was his Father (πατέρα ἴδιον), *making himself equal with God:*" and in the second, we find them assigning as the reason for the same, that he was guilty of "*blasphemy;*" for, that "being a man he *made himself God*," namely, by calling God his Father.—Well, have we now got a proof, that the appellation of THE SON OF GOD has been applied to our Lord *on account of his divine nature*, on account of *God being his* PROPER FATHER, ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ἴΔΙΟΝ? We have got more. We have got a proof, that our Lord himself lays down his life *in testimony of the truth of* THIS *application of the title.* By his acquiescence at his last moments in the sense which the Jews put upon those words, he proclaims his own divinity; and by proclaiming to the world this great truth as the last solemn declaration for which he yielded up his life, he has shown, beyond a doubt, *on what foundation* it is that his religion must be built, and in what the *preaching of Christ crucified* must consist. For the most valuable and important observations on this subject, I gladly refer the reader to the conclusion of the *Brief Memorial* of *Bishop Burgess:* and more particularly to the *admirable* Discourse delivered by the same author in the year 1790 before the University of Oxford; in which it is incontrovertibly shown, that *the Divinity of Christ is proved from his own declarations, attested and interpreted by his living witnesses the Jews.* I beg to direct the reader's attention also to the *Sequel* to this discourse, lately published by the same author; in which *The Testimony of Christ's Contemporaries to his own declaration of his Divinity* will be found most fully *confirmed by his Discourses, Actions, and Death.* This *Sequel* is contained in a Sermon preached by the *Bishop* at *Llanarth* and *Carmarthen* before a general meeting of the Clergy, in the months of September and October, 1814.—On the whole of the subject which has been here treated of, I cannot forbear recommending also to

ing totally the Unitarian solution of the appellation, SON OF GOD, applied to Jesus Christ. Indeed, so forcibly and emphatically are the sense and reason of the appellation here pointed out by the Evangelist, that the writer alluded to does not hesitate to pronounce this very circumstance to be a strong argument against the truth of the entire narrative of the miraculous conception, and an additional reason for its rejection. (*Belsham's Calm Inquiry*, p. 263.)

Such is the Unitarian mode of interpreting Scripture, on which we have frequently had occasion to remark. It is first laid down, on abstract principles of general reason, that a certain thing *cannot be*. Then comes Scripture declaring in plain words that *it is*. But then comes forward a *dictum* of *Priestley*, or *Evanson*, or *Lindsey*, or *Wakefield*, or *Cappe*, or *Belsham*, or *somebody* else[a], to assert that the words *may*,

particular notice, the observations of *Mr. Wilson*, from p. 1 to p. 140 of his *Illustration of the Method of explaining the New Testament by the early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ:* a work, on which I am not surprised that the Unitarian writers have uniformly preserved the profoundest silence; inasmuch as it triumphantly overturns the whole system of *Dr. Priestley's* theory of *Early Opinions*, on which they profess to place so firm a reliance, and has erected upon its ruins a complete demonstration of the *primitive* doctrine of the *Divinity of Christ*.

But to return to *Mr. Belsham:* he proceeds, in his note, to say, of the miraculous conception of our Lord, that it is "generally allowed, that the fact, if true, was unknown during his personal ministry."—"The fact, *if true*, was unknown," &c. What means this? Is it, that the fact, *if untrue*, might have been known? However, let the *logic* of this pass: it is but one specimen of a thousand. But as to its meaning, (which, after all, may be discovered,) what is it that he would infer, or what is it that he wishes to pronounce? By whom is it thus *allowed*, that the fact of the miraculous conception was unknown during our Lord's personal ministry? *Dr. Priestley* has allowed it to *Mr. Belsham:* and *Mr. Belsham* has allowed it to *Dr. Priestley*. The critics of this School have all allowed it to one another. But what has been the secret information by which these gentlemen, who have thus civilly agreed to allow this to each other, have been enabled to discover, that the fact of our Lord's miraculous conception was unknown during the period of his personal ministry? I must beg to ask, whether, "IF TRUE," (a case which *Mr. Belsham* kindly *allows* to *me* to suppose in the argument,) this fact was *unknown* to our Lord's mother, and to Joseph, and to all the parties, to whom, "IF TRUE," the whole transaction was perfectly known? Was the fact unknown to those who knew it? What patience can be proof against such monstrous absurdities, presenting themselves with the confidence of sound reasoning and plain common sense!

[a] There is so complete a specimen of this process, in the treatment of the beginning of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, by the Unitarian Editors, that I cannot forbear noticing it here; more particularly as the words of St. Paul apply so forcibly to the point at present

by some different translation, or punctuation, or some new and ingenious mode of interpreting, be made to bear some

under consideration. I shall give the passage according to their own version, (though it tends much to reduce the force of the original,) that the full value of their remarks upon it may be appreciated with every advantage they can thence derive.—"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated to the gospel of God, (which he had promised before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures,) *even the gospel* concerning his Son, who was born of the race of David, according to the flesh, *but* proved to be the son of God by power, according to the Holy Spirit, through his resurrection from the dead; *the gospel, I say, concerning* Jesus Christ our Lord."—[N. B. It is no great matter, if, in such passages particularly as are at open war with the Unitarian System by teaching the divinity of Christ, there should be, besides the puzzle of a new translation, a little additional confusion from omitting the mark of the beginning of a parenthesis, or, from some other slight matter of this kind, which may easily be thrown upon the press-compositor. In an IMPROVED VERSION with a CORRECTED TEXT, it is not to be expected, the object being of course to *correct the meaning*, that any attention will be paid to the trifling task of *correcting* "slips of the pen" or "errors of the press." This, indeed, is the less necessary, where, after all the pains bestowed upon a *corrected text*, it is intended, that in the *notes only* the true sense is to be found.]

Now what is the note of the Editors on the above passage from St. Paul, in which, if words have any meaning, the Apostle shows himself most careful to point out the distinction to be observed between the *human descent* and the *divine sonship*, of our Lord?—"The apostle COULD NOT mean, by this *phraseology* and *the antithesis which he here uses*, to assert or countenance the strange and unintelligble notion of *two natures* in Christ; one the *human nature, by which he was the descendant of David;* the other a *divine nature, by which he was the Son of God.*" That is, the Apostle *could not* mean what he directly expresses. The Unitarians have pronounced, upon general principles, that the *thing itself cannot be:* and therefore St. Paul *could not mean* to say what he *does* say. The peculiar *phraseology* and *antithesis* here used, and which could have been employed *only* for the very purpose of marking that distinction and opposition of natures, which these critics say the apostle *could not* mean to assert or countenance, are to be entirely set aside; and what the Apostle ought to have said is thus clearly laid before us, by one who knows the Apostle's meaning better than he did himself.—"The sense of the passage is *plainly* this, that Christ by natural descent was of the posterity of David; but that in a FIGURATIVE SENSE," (this is the *plain* meaning of the Apostle,) "*by designation of the Holy Spirit at his baptism*," (all this the Apostle kept to himself, but now we have the whole of it out *plainly*,) "he was the Son of God: or the *promised Messiah*, which was further proved by the extraordinary exertion of divine energy in raising him from the dead." And then, we are referred to one of the grand authorities, under which the Unitarians occasionally let us *plainly* into a variety of *secrets*, of which the language of the New Testament would otherwise not give us the slightest intimation:—"See *Mr. Lindsey's* second Address to the Students of the two Universities."—But, if it were necessary to refer the reader to any authority beyond the very words of the Apostle, I would refer him, (besides the great body of learned Commentators, among whom *Elsner* and *Hammond* deserve particular consideration,) to the authority of *Primate*

other *possible* meaning. But should all these fail, should the words be too plain, and simple, and precise, to admit any sort

Newcome; as well, because his observations are applied to the very translation adopted by the Editors; as, because their direct opposition in the sense of Scripture to him whom they propose as the model of their translation may lead the reader to a juster sense of the imposition practised on the public by the use that has been made of his name. —"*Observe*" (the *Archbishop* remarks) "the *opposition*. According to our Lord's *human descent*, he was the *offspring of David;* but according to the HOLY SPIRIT he was the SON OF GOD, and shown to be such by the display of God's power in raising him from the dead, Eph. i. 19, 20; Acts xiii. 33."—I would refer him, also, to Luke i. 35, where, at the very conception of our Lord, his twofold nature is opened up, being of the race of David by the flesh, but the *Son of God* by the *Holy Spirit;* and in this passage, perhaps, the true force of the word δύναμις which is used by St. Paul, may be discovered. —I would refer him, also, for that Gospel which St. Paul tells us here he was "called" and "separated" to preach, to Acts ix. 20, where we are informed, that the Gospel preached by him was, "that Christ was the SON OF GOD:" by which last words is manifestly not meant the *Messiah* or *Christ*, (as the Unitarians would have us understand, and are for that reason anxious to introduce the word *Jesus* into the text instead of *Christ*, but without sufficient authority, although recommended by *Griesbach,*) for then his preaching would merely be, that "Christ was Christ;" but, that "Jesus, who was Christ, was truly in his nature the *Son of God;*" *that Son of God*, which he was pronounced to be at his nativity because of his miraculous production by the Holy Spirit; which he affirmed himself to be continually throughout his ministry, even though the Jews accused him of thereby "making himself equal with God;" which he finally persevered in asserting that he was, although death was to be inflicted for the alleged blasphemy of the assertion; and which he *proved* himself to be, as St. Paul informs us, by his rising from the dead, showing to the world thereby that death could have no dominion over HIM: that, although, as to his *human* nature, he was indeed to be considered as *descended from David;* yet that as to that higher nature which belonged to him, his *Holy Spirit* which could not be affected by death, he was proved to be the Son of God.

I am happy, also, after all the flourish that the Editors have made about the impossibility of the contrast between the two natures in Christ being intended in this place by St. Paul, to have both themselves and their great supporters decidedly with me upon this point. For σὰρξ, they tell us, in John i. 14, (where they are anxious to establish the proper humanity of our Lord,) "peculiarly stands for *man* as *mortal.*" —*Mr. Belsham*, in his *Calm Inquiry*, (p. 227,) says, that this word, applied to our Lord in 1 Tim. iii. 16, means his being "really and truly a *man.*" The same signification is given to the word by *Dr. Carpenter*, (*Unit. the Doct.*, &c., pp. 64. 152. 185. 262,) with the intimation also of a secondary meaning, marking emphatically "the frailties of humanity." How then must these critics *consistently* render the words of St. Paul, κατὰ σάρκα? Manifestly, by the words "*according to his human nature.*" And thus, they establish the very contrast, which they explode as ridiculous: for then, his HOLY SPIRIT, in reference to which he was the *Son of God*, is put in direct opposition to his HUMAN NATURE, in reference to which he was the *Son of David.* Thus these profound critics, in their great anxiety to build up a sort of proof of the human nature of our Lord

of distortion, then they are clearly to be rejected as *spurious, because* the Unitarians have already determined that *the thing cannot be.*

in one place, assist in fortifying the demonstration of his divine nature in another. The builders of Babel were visited for *their* impiety with a confusion of language, such that they could not "understand *one another's speech.*" But there may be, it seems, a severer visitation: men may be made unable to understand *their own*—"prius dementat."

In truth, this passage of St. Paul's puzzles Unitarian critics extremely: and such of them as have any candour confess it, however they may be determined not to yield their grand position to the difficulty that presses upon it. *Dr. Carpenter* admits, that the Apostle means to mark a *distinction:* which distinction he puts thus for the Apostle: "Jesus was of the race of David as to his natural descent: and if he had not been so he could not have been the Messiah: but he was *more,* he was the Son of God." (*Unit.*, &c., p. 234.) And he adds, "that those persons manifest little regard to truth and candour, who assert that the Unitarians maintain that Jesus was a *mere* man." He then proceeds to make out some sort of distinctions, which Unitarians may *say* they comprehend, but with which I shall not take up the reader's time or my own. But this he admits plainly, that a distinction of nature is marked out; and such as to prove, that Jesus was *not a mere man.* This is a great length for a staunch Unitarian to go. I cannot expect him to travel with me farther. But surely we may say, *Great is the force of truth!* How ridiculous would it be to assert of our Lord, that he "was of the race of David as to his *natural descent,*" (I take even *Dr. Carpenter's* own distorted translation,) if he were a *mere man!* For, how should a *mere man* come of any race but by *natural descent?*

Before I quit this subject of the acceptation of the word σὰρξ, as implying what is strictly *man,* I must remark, that the Unitarians have shown much modesty in not rejecting all others from the denomination of Christians. For we are told, 1 John iv. 2, that "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh,*" (i. e. say they, as a *real man,*) "is of God."—And they, who do not so confess him, are pronounced not to be of God. The Unitarian might therefore here easily produce his Q. E. D. for the exclusion of all but the maintainers of Christ's proper humanity from the pale of Christianity.

I cannot conclude this note without requesting to be informed by the Unitarian editors, why,—in speaking of "the strange and unintelligible notion of *two natures* in Christ, one, the human nature by which he was the descendant of David; the other, a divine nature by which he was the Son of God,"—they did not call in the aid of those distinguished names, which they and their associates so exultingly boast of as auxiliary to their cause, the names of GROTIUS and of LOCKE. Perhaps, however, without troubling the editors for an answer, a sufficient reason may be found in the simple fact, that both these commentators hold this very "strange and unintelligible notion;" and, wonderful to say, speak of it as familiarly as if it were the most obvious and unquestionable.—Thus we find *Grotius,* on the words ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, pointing out familiarly the *opposition between the human and the divine natures,* which jointly appertained to our Lord:—"Non secundum τὸ θεῖον [*divinitatem quæ*] quod in ipso, sed secundum τὸ ἀνθρώπινον [*humanitatem.*"] Grotius on Rom. ix. 5:—and in these very words he is followed by *Rosenmüller,* in locum. *Locke,* in like manner, in his Comm. on Rom. i. 4, expresses himself:—"*According to the*

In the present case, however, *Mr. Belsham's* fellow-labourer in support of the Unitarian Version, *Dr. Carpenter*, might have relieved him from this *last necessity*. For whilst this writer, yielding to the force of overbearing evidence, admits, (in his treatise on *Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel*, pp. 353. 358,) that the passage in Luke must be received as genuine; he denies that it intimates any thing whatever of a miraculous conception. These two Unitarian writers I must leave to settle the matter between themselves. I am glad to find that I can agree in part with both. I agree with *Dr. Carpenter* that the passage is genuine: and I agree with *Mr. Belsham* that it *clearly describes* the miraculous conception of our Lord, as *the reason, why* the appellation, SON OF GOD, should be given to him.

In short, so marked and emphatical do we find the passage in St. Luke, that Unitarians could on no account permit it to hold its ground. One, accordingly, feeling its bearing in-

Spirit of holiness is here manifestly opposed to, *according to the flesh*, in the foregoing verse, and so *must mean* that more pure and spiritual part in him, which, BY DIVINE EXTRACTION, *he had immediately from God: unless this be so understood, the antithesis is lost.*" And this DIVINE EXTRACTION the same writer explains to us in another place thus:—"God, out of his infinite mercy, willing to bestow eternal life on mortal men, *sends Jesus Christ into the world;* who being conceived in the womb of a virgin (that had not known man), *by the immediate power of God* was *properly* THE SON OF GOD, according to what the Angel declared to his mother, Luke i. 30—35. So that, being the Son of God, he was, *like his Father*, IMMORTAL; as he tells us, John v. 26," &c. And this inherent immortal nature the same writer in another place pronounces to belong to Christ, when speaking of our Lord's declaration, John x. 18, that *he had power to lay down his life and power to take it up again*, he adds these words,—"which he could not have had, if he had been a MORTAL MAN," &c. See Locke's Works, vol. iii. pp. 66, 67, 68.—Why these two eminent writers were not referred to on the present subject, the reader is now probably enabled to conjecture. But what will be his reflections when he learns, that *Mr. Belsham*, *Dr. Carpenter*, and all their Unitarian fellow labourers, claim these very writers as concurring in *their* opinions touching the *mere human nature* of Christ, and unblushingly assert this in every publication?—This subject has been carefully and effectually discussed by *Bishop Burgess* in his *Letter to the Lay-Seceder*, and the false assumptions of the Unitarians openly exposed. And yet I entertain not the smallest doubt, that these great names, agreeably to the steady and immovable effrontery of Unitarian writers, and their invariable maxim of repeating their refuted assertions as if they never had been controverted, will be sounded again and again as of Unitarian authority, just as familiarly, as if no *demonstration* had ever been given to the public of the total unfoundedness of such a claim.

evitable, is for turning it out of the canon of Scripture altogether. Another, considering this too violent, and from better acquaintance with the subject, knowing the rejection of the passage itself to be utterly destitute of authority, is content if he can turn the miraculous conception out of *it:* at the same time that he satisfies himself, that even without going so far, he could have got rid of what every resolute Unitarian is determined to get rid of at any rate; for that the miraculous conception of itself indicates nothing of a superiority of nature. (*Unit. the Doct.*, &c., pp. 21. 25. 174. 352—360.) They, however, who are not disposed, with *Mr. Belsham*, to cut out part of St. Luke's Gospel; or, with *Dr. Carpenter*, to nullify the meaning of plain words, and to discharge from the first two chapters of Luke all intimation of a miraculous conception; will not hesitate to pronounce with me that THE SON OF GOD is a title distinctly assigned in genuine Scripture to our blessed Lord, *because* of his miraculous conception by the influence of the Holy Ghost; and, having done so, I have little doubt of their travelling farther with me, and pronouncing, also, that the appellation so given, and specifically on such account, is thereby intended and announced to designate the divine nature of our Lord. This passage, then, reaching, as it does, and is confessed to do, to the very vitals of Unitarianism, I leave the reader to form his own judgment on the attempt made by the Unitarian Editors to deprive it of its emphasis and force, by dragging in[a], even at the expense of all intelligible meaning, the *indefinite* form,

[a] That they violate common sense, no less than their engagements, by acting thus, is manifest, from this consideration, that, whilst they insist upon the *indefinite* form, and contend that our Saviour must in this place be called A Son of God; that is, one individual of a class so denominated; they are unavoidably involved in this absurd consequence,—that he was to be ranked in that class, *because of his miraculous conception;* for that is what the passage is then made to announce. And therefore a like miraculous conception becomes a requisite character of that entire class; or, in other words, it follows, that *all* who are called *Sons of God*, are brought into existence by the miraculous influence of the Holy Ghost. And thus these gainsayers of the miraculous conception would, according to their own showing, multiply the instances of it to no inconsiderable extent; as may be inferred from what has been quoted from them at pp. 117—120, of this volume.

to the exclusion of the *definite* form of *Archbishop Newcome:* and this, in two places, *without making any acknowledgment in either*, of their departure from the model which they profess to follow.

We come next to the instance in Number II.: in which, instead of "*power to become* children of God," which is the rendering of the *Received Version* and of *Archbishop Newcome*, we find the words "*authority to be* the children of God" introduced by the Editors of the New Version: and this, in like manner as in the preceding instance, without the slightest intimation of the change. The degree of value which the Editors attach to the distinction between the words POWER and AUTHORITY may be inferred from their observations on John x. 18; where they make a similar change in the translation of our Saviour's words concerning the laying down of his life. Here, having substituted for the *Primate's* rendering, "I have *power* to lay it down, and I have *power* to take it again,"—the following, "I have *authority* to lay it down, and I have *authority* to receive it again," they state, as their reason for the alteration, that the former "seems to imply that our Lord's resurrection was the effect of his own power; a sense[a]," they add, "which the words in the original

[a] In this passage, there are two assertions, on which I must make a few observations, for the purpose of showing, that they are, both, directly opposed to the plain truth of the case. The first of these assertions is, that the words in the original do not convey the sense which the *Primate's* translation implies, namely, that our Lord's resurrection was the effect of his own power: that is, it is meant to assert, that the word ἐξουσία does not strictly imply "*power*" in the ordinary sense of the word: and therefore it is, that the Editors render it by the word "*authority.*" In this they manifestly found themselves upon the criticism of *Wakefield;* who says, in his comment upon this verse, that "in *all* the variety of places where ἐξουσία is used, it *uniformly* means *authority*, or *privilege*, or a *delegated commission*, conferred by some superior." Now I might here at once refer the Editors, and this their chief oracle in matters of Greek criticism, to the various Lexicographers, and (as we are concerned with the Greek of Scripture) more particularly to *Trommius, Biel*, and *Schleusner*, who directly contradict this dogmatical and most unfounded assertion of *Wakefield*, by assigning to the word, besides the species of power implied by the terms *authority, privilege*, and *delegated commission*, the sense of *power* generally, in its fullest and strongest import; and support this sense of the word by numerous examples.—"1. *Vis et potestas efficiendi aliquid, facultas.*" — "2. *Libertas agendi.*"—"3. *Auctoritas,*" &c.—"4.

do not convey, and which is directly contrary to the most explicit declarations of the Scripture." Mr. *Belsham* also,

Licentia agendi et faciendi, jus."—Schleusner.—Trommius and *Biel*, also, in their researches into the application of the word by the *Seventy* and the other Greek interpreters of the *O. T.*, can discover in *their* use of it no other meanings than *Potestas, Dominium, Imperium, Dominatio.* But as the writers with whom we are here concerned spurn at the authority of names, unless indeed they be names such as those of *Priestley, Wakefield,* and *Lindsey,* (before which they readily admit that all the world should bow,) I will direct their attention to a few passages, which may show, if not to their satisfaction, at least to that of others, the true value of the criticism on which they build.

In Luke xii. 5, when our Lord warns the multitude, that they should fear him, "who, after he had killed, had POWER (ἐξουσίαν) to *cast into hell;*" I would ask, whether this power is here spoken of, as belonging to the *Father*, or to the *Son;* if to the *Father,* the Editors will be pleased to say, *by* whom it was *delegated;* and if, to the *Son,* I would recommend it to them to consider, what must be the nature of the Being to whom so vast a power is ascribed.—Again, in Acts xxvi. 18, when Paul is appointed to turn sinners "from the POWER of *Satan* unto God;" when in Romans ix. 21, it is asked whether "the potter" hath not "POWER over the clay;" and when in Revel. xx. 6, we are told of those, "over whom the second death had no POWER;" are we, in all these cases, to look to an *authority conferred,* a *commission delegated?* The word ἐξουσία is that which is employed in these, as well as in numerous other passages, in which to apply the phrase *authority* or *delegated commission,* would only excite laughter at the expense of the critic.—But to come more decisively to the point: we have in the Book of Daniel, according to the rendering of it both by *Theodotion,* (iii. 33, and iv. 31,) and by the *Seventy,* (iii. 33, and iv. 34, *Chig. MS. Holmes,*) the word ἐξουσία attributed to the *most High God,* and applied to express that *power* and *dominion* which he was to exercise over all the nations of the earth, and which was to be everlasting. Are we still then to consider this but as an *authority* "conferred by some superior?" Or, if these critics should imagine that *Theodotion* and the *Seventy* supply no authority for the Greek of the *New Testament,* what will they do with the passage in Acts i. 7, where we are told of the "Seasons, which THE FATHER hath put [ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ] in his own POWER?" Does this settle the point for *Mr. Wakefield* and his followers of the *Improved* N. T.? And here I cannot avoid an observation upon the manner in which *Mr. Wakefield* has in this last passage *smuggled* the word (I can use no other appropriate phrase) upon the *English* reader, under the disguise of the term "*disposal;*" passing over in perfect silence the text which so completely overturns his peremptory *dictum,* and taking care not to disturb his readers by the information, that it was the *same original* word, that, in "*all*" places, "*uniformly*" signified an *authority conferred by some superior,* that was here employed in speaking of the power of the FATHER. The Editors, who very much admire *Mr. Wakefield,* have followed him throughout. They too use the word "disposal" in this place; they annex no note; and are silent as to the term 'ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ.

Had the Unitarian Editors been really anxious to learn the true meaning of the word 'ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ, instead of seeking out a *possible* acceptation, whereby they might exclude an obnoxious sense of Scripture, and obtain support for a pre-determined theory, they might have found in *Bishop Pearce's Commentary* on John i. 12, an enumeration of its meanings very different indeed from

in his laborious gloss upon this New Version, strains with all that of *Mr. Wakefield.* "The word ἐξουσία signifies *power* in general; sometimes a *natural* power, sometimes an *usurped* power, and sometimes a power *given by human or divine laws:* and in this last case it is best rendered by a *right* or *privilege*, as it should be in 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, 6, and perhaps in Matth. vii. 29, and Mark i. 22."

We have now seen to what the Unitarian criticism on the word ἐξουσία amounts; and from this we may be enabled to appreciate the credit due to the first assertion, that the words in the original do not convey the sense which is implied in the *Primate's* translation. There is indeed another word in the original, which, as the Editors have given it a meaning different from the *Primate's*, they may possibly have intended to allude to it in this position. On this some remarks will be made in the succeeding note; and, therefore, I omit it here, and proceed to the second assertion of the Editors, as to the opposition between the sense commonly ascribed to the passage, and the declarations of other parts of Scripture. The parts of Scripture to which they refer us, are Acts ii. 24; iii. 15; xvii. 31; Rom. vi. 4; and 1 Cor. xv. 15. The object, for which they refer to these parts of Scripture, is to shew, that our Lord is spoken of as having *been raised* from the dead; a thing, which they conceive to be contradictory to what is generally supposed to be affirmed in the passage before us, relative to our Lord's resurrection having been the effect of *his own power.* Now, the first of the texts, to which they have here referred, appears most inauspiciously in the van of this adverse array. For what does it announce?—that our Lord was raised up, "*because it was not possible* (καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν) that he should be holden of death."—"It was not possible," (says *Wolfius*, among other reasons,) "because Christ was life itself, and therefore not to be subdued by the power of death"—"ipsa erat vita, adeoque a morte nunquam penitus superandus."—*Cur. Phil.* vol. ii. p. 1036.—But in this search after texts relating to the resurrection of Christ, is it not strange, that the industry of the Editors did not conduct them to the passage in John ii. 19; in which, our Lord himself particularly describes the time of his rising from the grave, and the power by which he was to rise? "Destroy this temple," he says, (by which, it is immediately subjoined, he meant the *temple of his body,*) "and in three days I WILL RAISE IT UP."—Matth. xxvi. 61, also testifies to the same declaration. What is the reason that this declaration of our Lord has not been included in the enumeration of texts collected by the Editors; and how has it happened, that neither in John nor in Matthew, as it met their eye, has it drawn from them a single observation? On some subjects silence speaks loudly. The reader will draw his own conclusion. Here then we have two solemn declarations from our Lord himself; one, in the passage which forms the subject of this note, that he had the *power* to *raise himself* from the dead; and the other in the passage just referred to, that he would *exert* that power in *raising himself* on the third day. Are we then to set aside our Lord's own declarations, made with the greatest solemnity and precision, in deference to some general expressions of his Apostles? Unitarians are not commonly in the habit of paying such deference to the Apostles, whom they do not scruple continually to charge with blundering and prejudice. However, it is here convenient to believe them in opposition to our Lord himself. But, in truth, there is after all no real opposition. No difficulty can arise, on this head, to him who will embrace the plain language of Scripture, and admit the truth which it everywhere inculcates concerning the real nature of our Lord. To those, indeed, who deny our Lord's divinity, the

his might, even to the falsifying of the authority to which he refers, to support the propriety of the above observations [a].

direct language of Scripture will appear here, as it must everywhere, inconsistent with itself: and this very circumstance supplies an additional confirmation of the one grand truth which Unitarians so pertinaciously resist. That the *Father* and the *Son*, both possessed (as the Scriptures inform us) of that infinite power which alone could raise the dead to life, should both be said to perform the act of re-uniting the spirit of Christ to the body which he had assumed, so as to cause the re-animating of that body and his resurrection from the grave, has nothing in it irreconcileable to reason, and has every thing in it reconcileable to Scripture, and fully satisfies the several declarations of the N. T. upon that subject. *Wolfius*, in his *Cur. Phil.* (ii. 1055,) refers to *Fessilius*, whose work I have never seen, for an explanatory view of this matter. But to those who wish for full satisfaction upon this point, I would recommend the perusal of the second number of the fifth article of *Pearson on the Creed*, particularly from page 254 to 258, in which that learned and accurate writer lays the whole of the subject clearly open to the meanest capacity, at the same time that he fully exposes the glosses and cavils with which Socinians have laboured to perplex the truth.

We have sufficiently considered the value of the two assertions which the Unitarian Editors have so confidently advanced upon the meaning of the passage in John x. 18. I shall now close this note with the observations made upon it by some foreign Scholars of eminence, to the last named of whom the Unitarians are occasionally desirous to appeal. *Wolfius* remarks upon this text, "Ex his *manifestum* est, *Christum vitam propriâ virtute sibi restituisse.*"—*Cur. Phil.* ii. 911.—*Gerdes* also, in his *Meletemata Sacra*:—"Christum propriâ suâ virtute resurrecturum prædixerat IPSE, Joh. ii. 19. —Ille enim quemadmodum *potestatem habebat* (Joh. x. 18.)—θεῖναι, abjiciendi quasi *animam*, h. e. vitam suam, ita et ἐξουσίαν *potestatem* atque *auctoritatem* habere se profitebatur, πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτὴν, *iterum resumendi eam*, ut revocare *eam* rursumque sibi vendicare posset. Eum igitur *semet ipsum resuscitasse* non minus diserte tradunt Evangelistarum et Apostolorum scripta, qui cum vel ita κατ' ἐξοχὴν sit declaratus Filius Dei ἐν δυνάμει, Rom. i. 4: qui non alios solum, sed semet ipsum resuscitaverat, juxta illud Apostoli, quod *secundus homo sit* SPIRITUS VIVIFICANS." He states also, that, by the Scriptures, Christ was to be raised by God the Father; and therefore concludes, that he was raised from the dead by the divine power belonging both to his Father and to himself:—"tertia die a mortuis CUM CŒLESTIS PATRIS TUM PROPRIA VIRTUTE DIVINA est RESUSCITATUS." —pp. 68. 73, 74. And *Rosenmüller*, after thus rendering the clause, "*ut vitam* SPONTE DEPONO *ita eam* SPONTE RECUPERO," gives a paraphrase of the text in the following words: "Nemo, *ne Pater quidem*, me *cogit*, ut moriar pro grege. *Sponte* in me suscepi ut vitam *deponam*. Sed idem ego etiam *sponte meâ* in vitam *redibo*." He goes on also to observe on the concluding clause, what I could wish those new-light critics, who pretend to derive aid from this writer on the subject of the Atonement, would take into their consideration.—"Notandus est hic locus adversus *blasphemas* eorum *calumnias* qui *Deum injuste egisse* clamant quod *filium innocentem morti tradiderit.* Quicquid Christus passus est et fecit, id omne *sponte in se suscepit*, ex amore erga Patrem et genus humanum. Pater, inquit Jesus, amat me, quia sponte hæc facio et patior; et ego hæc ita facio et patior, ut doceam me esse plenum amore erga Patrem."—*Scholia in Nov. Test.* ii. 426.

[a] It is scarcely possible, consistently

It is therefore manifest how important a difference the Editors conceive to exist between the words AUTHORITY and

with truth, to speak in any other terms than those which I have been here compelled to use, of *Mr. Belsham's* treatment of *Schleusner's* authority on the word λαβεῖν in the passage of John x. 17, 18. The reader shall judge for himself. The word λαβεῖν, this writer and the Editors had found it convenient (after *Mr. Wakefield*) to render "*receive*," in place of the usual rendering "*take;*" and to justify this, *Mr. Belsham* subjoins a note, assigning the meanings given to the Greek word by *Schleusner.*—"'λαμβάνω, manu aliquid capio, Matt. xiv. 19: aliâ quacunque ratione accipio, Matt. vii. 3: rursum accipio, recupero, Matt. xix. 29; Joh. xiii. 12.' Schleusner."—See *Calm Inquiry*, p. 173. Here is the quotation from *Schleusner*, in the precise form in which *Mr. Belsham* has given it, even to the inverted commas.

Now, in the first place, it is surely a gross falsification of his author, to give, as *one continued quotation* from him (as the established meaning of the form here employed by *Mr. Belsham* unequivocally implies,) that, which is an arbitrary selection of words drawn violently together from various parts of a lengthened context, in the present case amounting to more than an entire column of close printing. But even this is pardonable, compared with what yet remains to be noticed. Will any one believe it possible, that, between the words "recupero" and "Matt. xix. 29," which are presented as immediately joined in the quotation from *Schleusner* given to us by *Mr. Belsham*, there are found in the original the words that follow—"resumo, i. q. πάλιν λαμβάνω. (John x. 17.")—that is, *the decidedly active signification assigned by Schleusner to the word* λαβεῖν *in the very passage now under consideration, is actually cut out by Mr. Belsham, and the parts on each side adjoining stitched together, so that all now appears one continued texture: and Schleusner's name is made to meet the eye of the reader as an authority for that sense of a passage* GOING DIRECTLY TO THE DIVINE NATURE OF OUR LORD, *the direct contrary of which sense Schleusner had assigned to it in the part which has been thus purloined?* Now, what shall be said of such conduct as this? Is it too much to charge writers who are guilty of it with direct and deliberate falsehood? Yet this is, in fact, the prevailing practice with Unitarian writers; and these are the persons, who are everywhere loudest in the profession of their attachment to THE TRUTH. But it is not wonderful, that they, who are determined to resist and subvert that ONE GREAT TRUTH, which our Lord came into the world to inculcate, should (however loud their pretensions) set but little value upon every other.

But let us attend *Mr. Belsham* somewhat farther upon the subject of this passage.—From the mutilated extract, which he has given us from *Schleusner*, he is, after all, able to infer no more, than that the word λαμβάνω is not "*necessarily* taken in an *active* sense."—To find this out he need not have travelled so far. Every school-boy could have told him that. The last clause of the verse would have told it to him as clearly as a thousand Lexicons. Well, what then? He goes on without ceremony to pronounce, that here it *is* "to be taken in a *passive* sense." [Indeed if I were to suppose his words used with *precision*, I should conclude that τίθημι to *lay down*, is also to be taken in a *passive* sense; for he says, that in this passage, "though *active verbs* are used, they are to be taken in a passive sense"—the verb τίθημι is the *only other* verb to which this can apply. Now can he possibly mean, that this too is to be taken in a *passive* sense? But some writers must not be taken too strictly—and therefore I am willing to admit that

POWER: and it seems equally manifest, that the reason why they have so carefully avoided the use of the latter term in this is not his meaning.] He proceeds, "'I have authority to *receive* it again,' q. d. If I voluntarily expose myself to suffering and death, I am assured by my Father that the life so sacrificed shall be speedily restored."—So then, because the verb *may by possibility* be taken passively, it *is to be* taken passively: and because the word ἐξουσία *may by possibility* be rendered *authority*, it *is to be so* rendered. And then the passage is fitted for the *gloss*, which it was to be moulded to meet, and which *Mr. Belsham* has put on it, as above. In this gloss it is stated, that the life, which our Saviour voluntarily sacrificed, was to be speedily restored to him,—by the Father of course. Now, will *Mr. Belsham* be good enough to inform us, how a person can be said to have an AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE that, in the acceptance of which he can take no part, and exercise no option, being but the *passive* subject on which an external power freely exerts itself, without resistance or co-operation from the subject of its action. The AUTHORITY TO DO NOTHING, seems an odd species of AUTHORITY. Yet this *is* the AUTHORITY, with which (if we believe these *Improvers* of our Version of the N. T.) our Lord, with great solemnity, declares to the Jews, he had been invested. The AUTHORITY to be a MERE RECIPIENT, such as the AUTHORITY of the *cask* to RECEIVE the infused liquid, was surely a strange AUTHORITY for our Lord to *assure* the Jews he had derived from his Father. Well might his hearers in that case have pronounced him mad indeed. But if, in the exercise of the power of God to raise our Lord to life, who being a mere man, dead and buried, could have no part whatever in the act, but was simply the passive subject of it, it be still contended, that our Lord is properly said to have had AUTHORITY to RECEIVE his life back again; is not the same true of all mankind, and must we not then consistently say of every man, when he is raised from the grave, that he has been invested with an AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE his life back again? Can any thing be more monstrously absurd? Really, it is lamentable, that they whose time might be better employed than in combating the follies of Unitarian Expositors, should be detained by such arrant and inexplicable nonsense. And yet it is unavoidable. Whilst the tares are craftily and thickly sowing, it is unavoidably necessary to guard the wheat.

We have seen how decidedly *Mr. Belsham* is of opinion, that the word λαβεῖν is to be taken in a *passive* sense. But, after having settled this point quite to his own satisfaction, he immediately turns to an interpretation of *Grotius*, which he seems to adopt with great complacency, and in which it is requisite that this same verb should be taken *actively*—"vitam eripere." In short, —active or passive,—it signifies nothing to the critics we are concerned with, whether it be the one or the other, or a jumble of both together; let it but tend to prove the *Son of God* to be a mere man "fallible and peccable" like themselves, and it is instantly embraced. *Mr. Belsham* also goes so far, in his complacent acceptance of *Grotius's* interpretation, as to admit, not only the *active* sense of the verb λαβεῖν; but the *obnoxious* sense of the noun ἐξουσίαν; letting in freely the idea of *power*, which he had before taken such pains to exclude. So that now, since *Grotius's* explanation does not involve the notion of our Lord's resurrection, and consequently does not involve the exercise of a divine power by our Lord, he is willing, with that writer, to attribute both to the noun and to the verb the fullest exertion of *power* in its most complete *activity*. So much for Unitarian *criticism*.

The critics of this school (it should

John i. 12, is, that the bestowing a *power* upon the minds of men, whereby they might be enabled to qualify themselves

be remembered) are ready enough to adduce various readings where they suit their purpose, and to lay upon them full as much stress as is admissible. But they did not think it necessary, in discussing the force of the verb, as to its active or passive signification, in the passage before us, to announce, that, in two MSS., one of them of such high authority as the *Cambridge* MS. or *Codex Bezæ*, the reading for λαβεῖν is ἆραι, settling the active sense beyond the possibility of cavil.—Before I quit the consideration of this verse of John, I think it right to add, that the concluding clause, in which our Lord says, "this commandment have I received from my Father," *Bishop Pearce* is of opinion is to be understood of the command *to say*, as our Lord had just said:—for which he refers to John xii. 49, 50.

I should not deal fairly by *Mr. Belsham*, if I did not mention, that he has not given his explanation of the passage we have been considering, as one perfectly insulated; but has in some degree hinged it upon the interpretation he had supplied of another passage in the same Evangelist, ii. 19; in which our Saviour has spoken of *his raising up* the temple of his body in three days. The former passage, he informs us, is "to be explained upon the same principles" as this. Now that the author may not be misunderstood, and that we may the better know what those "principles" are, I shall lay the entire of his explanation of this passage before the reader.—"The resurrection of Jesus is *uniformly* ascribed in the sacred writings to the power of God, Acts ii. 32; x. 40; xvii. 31; Rom. vi. 4; viii. 11. Our Lord's expression is *therefore* to be understood *figuratively; not* that he would raise *himself*, but that he would *be raised by God. Thus*, when it is said, 'the dead shall *rise*,' 1 Thess. iv. 16, all that is intended is, that they shall *be raised* by a divine power. Mark v. 41; John xi. 44; v. 28, 29."—This is the whole. Now, I beg the reader's most particular attention to this entire argument; as it supplies an infallible mode of removing the authority of every untoward passage throughout the Scripture, one by one, without the smallest difficulty.—First, it is *asserted*, that "the resurrection of Jesus is *uniformly* ascribed in the sacred writings to the power of God."—UNIFORMLY—no exception of course. Now, in the first place, there are to the full as many passages in the N. T. in which our Lord is said simply to *rise* from the dead as there are passages in which he is said to *be raised* (and even of these last, there is at least, a third part, in which it is not *expressed*, by what power, whether his own or that of God the Father, he was to *be raised*.)—On these passages, however, I lay no stress, as, where our Lord is spoken of simply as rising from the dead, it does not appear *expressly* by *what power* he was to *rise*, whether by his own or not. But it may give the reader some idea of the accurate regard to truth manifested by a writer, who positively affirms, that in EVERY ONE OF THESE the resurrection of Jesus IS ASCRIBED TO THE POWER OF GOD; meaning thereby the FATHER. But the point to be particularly observed in *Mr. Belsham's* application of the word "UNIFORMLY," in this case, is, that, at the moment he makes the assertion, he has before his eyes a passage, in which, in language as significant and unequivocal as language can be, our Lord declares that he would *raise himself by his own power;* and in another passage in the very same page of *Mr. Belsham's* book, our Lord again declares distinctly that he *had the power of raising himself* from the dead. Yet *Mr. Belsham*, with both these passages in his view, at once positively affirms that the contrary is UNIFORMLY asserted throughout the

for that improved condition, in which they should become "Children of God," and heirs of the promises of the Gospel,

Scripture! is asserted of course, in *these very passages:* and then he proceeds to PROVE, ON THE GROUND OF THIS VERY AFFIRMATION, THAT *THESE PASSAGES* DO ASSERT IT. Now, the reader will please to carry in his recollection, that this AFFIRMATION of Mr. Belsham's is the *whole of his* PROOF. For then he goes on to state, "that our Lord's expression" (in John ii. 19, viz., the expression which ascribes to our Lord the power of raising himself) "is *therefore* to be understood FIGURATIVELY." The argument, then, runs thus: "The thing which this text *asserts* is *never* asserted: *therefore* the text is to be taken *figuratively;* for, if taken *literally*, it *expresses* that which I *have affirmed* it does *not* mean." Then he goes on, *ex abundanti*, (for surely all is long ago PROVED,) to instance the *figurative* application of like forms of expression to those here employed. "THUS when it is said the dead shall *rise;* all that is intended is, that they shall *be raised* by a divine power." Now, it is important, that the parallel expressed so emphatically by the word THUS, and which is to reconcile every mind to the naturalness of the *figure* here employed, should be carefully attended to. When our Lord speaks of RAISING HIMSELF from the dead, he means that he should be "BE RAISED BY GOD;" by the same sort of figure precisely with that, by which, "when it is said the dead shall 'RISE,' it is intended, that they shall 'BE RAISED' by a divine power." In like manner, to present a parallel case, we reason thus:—When a weight ascending by the action of a machine is said in common language to RISE, it is meant that the weight IS RAISED by an external power; *therefore*, when a man is said to RAISE HIMSELF from the ground, it must mean that he is RAISED from it by some *other power than his own.* Some persons indeed might be so scrupulous as to expect, that *Mr. Belsham*, in order to make his conclusion perfectly satisfactory, should have given some instance of a dead man being said to RAISE HIMSELF, or of a person, under any circumstances, being said to RAISE HIMSELF, when it is clearly meant that he was NOT to RAISE HIMSELF, but to BE RAISED by some one else. *Mr. Belsham* may possibly consider this as a little too precise. But to extend satisfaction more widely, he may perhaps be induced in a new Edition of his work to supply a few examples of this kind.—The reader has now seen the whole of *Mr. Belsham's* PROOF.

There are two passages which contain our Saviour's own express declarations of his power to raise himself from the dead: one, as we have seen, in John ii. 19; and the other in John x. 17, 18.—The latter *Mr. Belsham* says, is to be explained on the same principle as the former, (helping out the case a little, at the same time, by a false quotation from *Schleusner;*) and the former he disposes of in the manner I have just described; namely, by asserting that it does not mean what it expresses; for that what it expresses is *never* meant anywhere in Scripture.

Indeed, it must be remarked, this last is a favourite and never-failing mode of establishing the sense of Scripture with *Mr. Belsham* and his brother critics of the Unitarian School. These words do not imply a particular meaning, *because* they *never* imply such a meaning—'Εγένετο in John i. 3, *does not* signify CREATED; *because* the verb γίνομαι is *nowhere* used by St. John in the sense of *create.* (*See Mr. Belsham* and *Dr. Carpenter.*) Πάντα, in the same verse, *does not* signify the UNIVERSE, *because* it "*never* signifies the UNIVERSE in St. John's writings."—For these and many other instances of such irresistible argumentation, I refer to the valuable Tract of *Bishop Burgess*, already spoken of,

would argue such an influential operation on the nature of the Moral Agent, as, coupled with the strong and marked de-

pp. 74—79. And to the same excellent Tract I would direct the reader for a variety of cases similar to that introduced at the beginning of this note: in which, by mutilated and falsified quotations from *Schleusner*, that writer's name is made to appear in support of interpretations of Scripture, which he directly condemns: and condemns in the very places, from which the critics of whom we speak carve out and extract those quotations. See pp. 75—96 of *The Bible and nothing but the Bible*, &c. *Mr. Belsham* does not stand alone in the pillory, which the author has erected in this portion of his work for the exposure of such misdemeanors as the above; but *Dr. Carpenter*, also, is there presented as involved in the disgrace.

I had hoped, that I might here at least put an end to the disgusting detail of unfair evasions, uncritical glosses, and unchristian principles, with which I have been obliged most reluctantly to swell this note; but I have this moment cast my eye upon a passage of *Mr. Belsham*, in one of the later numbers of the *M. Repository*, which, both as exemplifying some of the modes of criticism already instanced, and as evincing the progress which that writer's opinions are rapidly making towards their natural goal, I feel myself not at liberty to withhold from the reader. After schooling an old Unitarian pupil, *Mr. J. Jevans*, pretty smartly, for giving in to any thing approaching so near to the true sense of Scripture, as admitting the idea of expiation for *moral* offences under the Jewish system, (favouring him, in the course of it, with the appellation of "a very Draco in legislation," and condescendingly sneering at the gross mistakes of his "good friend,") he goes on to settle the point in the usual manner. "Expiation for *moral* offences is NEVER required in the Jewish Scriptures, and the very idea of it is rejected with indignation and abhorrence." He then proceeds to assert, that "under the Law things unconsecrated were *atoned*, i. e. brought into a consecrated state, by being sprinkled with the blood of an animal victim;" and that the same applies in the N. T. to believers in Christ, who are thus said to be reconciled by the blood of Christ; "i. e. transformed from an unholy to a holy, from a heathen to a Christian state:"—that, "in a sense analogous to this, Christ is *said to have died* FOR HIS OWN SINS as well as those of the people, Heb. vii. 27."—And why? because, "being of the tribe of Judah, he was not qualified to officiate as a priest, till he was consecrated with his own blood."—He then winds up the whole with stating, that "this is the idea which runs through the Epistle to the Hebrews, and by which the *fanciful* but eloquent writer endeavours to reconcile his half-believing countrymen to the offensive doctrine of a crucified Messiah:" but that, "*neither does he, nor do any* of the writers of the N. T. EVER hint at the MODERN doctrine," (a doctrine *so* modern as to be only of about 1800 years' standing,) "of the blood of Christ being shed as an *expiation for* MORAL *offences*:" and he then establishes the whole by actually declaring, "I am PERSUADED that the idea of a doctrine so repugnant to reason and the divine perfections, and to the most explicit declarations of the prophets of the Old Testament, NEVER ONCE entered into their minds." Vol. ix. pp. 755, 756. —Here is a rant, that surely NEVER was equalled before the days of *Mr. Belsham*: a rant, that would be to the last degree ludicrous, if it were not to the last degree shocking. So then, Christ, in all those numberless parts of Scripture, in which he is said to have died for OUR SINS, is not meant to have died on account of our MORAL offences, (what *other* offences can we as moral agents commit?) nor is he said

clarations of the divine nature of Christ throughout the context, threatened destruction to the Unitarian scheme: whereas, the giving an *authority* to be ranked in a certain class, might be consistent with a mere declaration of the capacity, and viewed but as the ministerial announcement of a title, or, at most, as the transmission of a delegated privilege. It is to be remembered, that the passage under consideration is found in that part of Scripture, where Unitarians always flounder: a part, where every clause (in its fair interpretation) is fatal to their system; and where it is indispensable that they should explain away the just sense of almost every word, in their endeavour to shut out the evidence of our Lord's divinity: a part of Scripture, which, though tortured by the advocates of the Socinian heresy into a hundred different shapes, still haunts them with the reassumption of that one hated form on which they are terrified to look, still presents to them the blessed Jesus, the Eternal Son of God, whom they cannot bear to behold as he is, "*the only begotten of the Father*, full of grace and truth."

The word 'ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ, which the Editors have frequently translated POWER in other parts of the New Testament, they could not afford to render in that dangerous sense here. And whilst, again, in some other places, in which they have departed from their model in using the word AUTHORITY, they have not scrupled to confess that they had done so, yet

to have made expiation for OUR SINS, other than as he made expiation for HIS OWN SINS. So much for the *Theology*. Next for the *Ecclesiastical history*. We have a positive declaration, that the idea, that expiation by the sacrifice of Christ related to the MORAL OFFENCES of mankind, is a matter of MODERN invention; whilst the writings of the Fathers from the earliest age proclaim the doctrine in almost every page, and with a strength which has been the subject of severe animadversion from Socinian critics of former days, who, indeed, knew something of what the writings of the Fathers did contain.—Last of all, the *Reasoning*. *Mr. Belsham* AFFIRMS, "that expiation for *moral* offences is NEVER required in the Jewish Scriptures;" that it is NEVER referred to the *blood of Christ* by the writers in the N. T.: and that he is "*persuaded*" that it "NEVER ONCE entered into their minds." What shall we say to all this? Have such men altogether lost their senses, or, do they imagine that the world have lost theirs? Yet these are the expositors, who are to enlighten mankind, by the soundest principles of reasoning, and the most correct views of Scripture truth!

here it was not deemed prudent to draw attention to the difference; and the translation of the *Primate* is, accordingly, quietly slid away from, in profound silence as to the variation. What renders this still the more remarkable, is, that two explanatory notes are attached to this 12th verse, one of them to the clause containing the very word in question: and whilst the Editors entertain us in these notes with some sage and profound remarks of *Mr. Cappe*, they forget altogether once to mention the name of *Dr. Newcome*. In one of these notes, indeed, they treat us from *Mr. Cappe* with a sort of compensation for their omissions elsewhere. For, in describing to us those who are called "Children of God," as the "partakers of a divine nature," they seem anxious to bestow upon men that *divine nature* which they refuse to our Lord. This is not ill contrived for their objects. It tends to familiarize the reader to the idea, that these words may be used in such a sense as is perfectly compatible with a merely human condition: and, therefore, if, after all possible prunings, interpolations, and glosses, they should at any time be compelled to admit that Scripture attributes a[a] *divine nature* to

[a] The reader must before this be fully aware, that the grand *secret* of Unitarianism, throughout, is to retain *names*, and to reject *things*. By this alone it is contrived to keep up any appearance of a distinction between it and open *Deism;* to which, from the days of *Socinus*, it had continued for a long time to approximate by a gradual progress; but which it now approaches by such rapid accelerations, under the quickening impulses it has received in later days from *Priestley*, *Lindsey*, and *Belsham*, that it has become at length a matter of some difficulty to discover a deficiency of actual contact. Instances establishing the truth of the above position have been plentifully offered in the pages of this work. But there are some very recent evidences on this head, to which I cannot forbear soliciting the farther attention of the reader. In the *Monthly Repository*, (at present the grand Storehouse of Unitarian Deism,) we meet with a proposal (Vol. viii. p. 111) to admit the *use of the phrase*, DIVINITY OF CHRIST, affixing to it the sense merely of a *divine commission;* in other words, admitting it in the sense in which it would be equally applicable to Moses or Elijah. The writer, who proposes this, recommends it on the ground of the *denial of the Divinity of our Lord* having proved a *Stumbling-block*, in the way of those whom it had been endeavoured to *proselyte* to the Unitarian doctrine: and for this reason he laments, that *Dr. Priestley* had in a Tract of his, *professed* to direct his arguments against the DIVINITY of *Christ;* and he adds, (what deserves particular attention,)—"Were I a member of the Committee of the London Book Society, I should be strongly tempted to move, that the word 'DEITY' should be substituted for 'DIVINITY' in

our Lord; it is then to be recollected, that this may be done in a sense which will not interfere with his *proper humanity*,

the title-page of the next edition." That is, I beg it may be observed, *Dr. Priestley*, who is already become rather old-style from the rapid progress of Unitarianism, is to be presented to the public in the modern taste of Hackney; and a false title to be given to the treatise of their deceased Champion, the better to delude and entrap the unwary.—This suggestion, too, we shall see, has not been lost upon the party. For again in the ixth vol. of the same *Repository*, (p. 428,) we find that one of their most active controversialists has published an Essay, to establish the propriety of distinguishing between the DEITY of Christ and his DIVINITY; in order that Unitarians may be enabled, consistently with their favourite notions as to the former, openly to assert their admission of the latter. But I submit it to Unitarian ingenuity, whether the matter of *appearance* might not be carried yet farther; and a tolerable sense discovered, in which the DEITY of Christ might be admitted *in words*, no less than his DIVINITY. *Dr. Priestley's* remark on *William Penn's* vindicatory declaration, "that he did not deny the ETERNAL DEITY of Christ," supplies a hint towards effecting this point. For, in showing how this declaration was reconcileable with *Penn's* belief of the *perfect humanity* of Christ, *Dr. Priestley* observes, "he only appears to have meant, that the DEITY of the FATHER resided in the MAN Christ Jesus, which is" (he adds) "what *every Socinian* acknowledges."—See *Triumph of Truth*, p. 4.—Indeed it must be farther observed, that this idea of the admission of Christ's DIVINITY has already proved productive in the hands of Unitarians; for they assert, in the page of the *Repository* before referred to, that they can now speak of him as "MORE THAN MAN." Quere, may they not soon find some means of devising a sense for the word TRINITY itself; through which they may also profess a belief in that; so that at length, as far as mere *words* go, (*Dare verba* should surely be the motto of Unitarians,) the Christian may find nothing to startle him on entering the Vestibule of their *Anti-Christian* mansion?—They had long ago secured to themselves the free use of the term *Atonement*: they have now gained to their *vocabulary*, the *Super-human nature*, and even the *Divinity* of Christ.—

But, much as has been said in the course of these Volumes on their mode of treating the subject of the *Atonement* in their discussions of that doctrine, I have something of recent occurrence to lay before the reader upon this point, which cannot but convince him, (if he be not already convinced,) that their real object in admitting in terms a doctrine of *Atonement*, is, the more effectually to overturn its nature and to annihilate its substance. The Editors of the Unitarian Journal already spoken of, having, in their Number for December 1814, notified their intention of making the doctrine of the Atonement the subject of their special examination in a series of ensuing publications, and having for this purpose invited the free communications of their several correspondents: their first Number for the year 1815, accordingly, opened the promised discussion: and in the outset I find the following cautionary letter, which I deem too important not to transcribe entire.—"I perceive, that your thoughts" (addressing the Editor) "have been, and will, for a time, be much turned to the Scripture doctrine of *Atonement*. It appears to me very desirable, that some person should give us a simple view of that subject, devoid of all manner of controversy. All persons who read their Bible must see that much is said about it both in the Old Testament and the New. The question then is, *What is it?* IF WE ATTEMPT TO EX-

(as they call it;)—exactly parallel to their mode of management in another place, where they endeavour to level God to the nature of man, because our Saviour had reminded the Jews of the language in the Old Testament addressed to men, "Ye are Gods."

But to return. We have now considered a second case,

PLAIN IT ALL AWAY, OR MAKE WHAT IS SAID OF OUR LORD'S DEATH, IN RELATION TO IT, A MERE SHADOW AND THE SHADOW OF A SHADE, AND DO NOT GIVE THE PUBLIC SOMETHING DETERMINATE AND SUBSTANTIAL, THAT THEY CAN FIX AND REST THEIR THOUGHTS UPON, I AM VERY MUCH INCLINED TO THINK THAT THEY WILL CONTINUE TO VIEW THE SUBJECT IN THE MANNER THEY NOW DO AND LONG HAVE DONE. Nothing, not a word of a controversial nature should be said in it, concerning the person of our Lord, &c., that the reader's mind may not, on that account, be prejudiced against it. Some writers, by attempting too much, effect little or nothing. They forget, *hasten slowly.*"—To this is subscribed the name of *J. Jevans,* a staunch and zealous Unitarian, who had been a pupil of *Mr. Belsham;* but who, as may be collected from the preceding note, holds notions on the subject of expiation of a much higher order than his Tutor. Now, on this letter of a sincere friend to Unitarianism, and well acquainted with its *esoteric,* I make no comment. —Nothing can be here wanting to assist the reader's digestion.—As to the writer of this letter, it is probable that he felt it *necessary* to suggest the cautions which it contains, from the extravagant manner in which Mr. Belsham had, just before, in the controversy with him on the subject of the Jewish Sin-offerings, represented the nature of the Atonement by the blood of Christ: pronouncing, as we have seen in the foregoing note, that "the blood of Christ was not shed as an expiation for *moral* offences," and consequently not shed in expiation of offences at all: from which it follows, that, when our Lord himself declares that his *blood was shed for the remission of sins,* he can mean nothing that relates in any degree to human offences of any kind at the present day: or that, in other words, *Atonement* (so far as men are now concerned) means, precisely, NOTHING. *Remission of Sins* might, indeed, be considered applicable to the *Candlesticks of the Temple,* or to *our Lord himself; their sins* and *his* might, it seems, *be remitted:* (see *Mr. Belsham* in the paper before quoted; also *Imp. Vers.* pp. 514. 518:) but as to the entire race of human beings now existing, there is *no sense* of the words, in which, (according to our *Improved* Expositors,) the shedding of blood can be conceived to have any connexion with the *remission of* THEIR *sins.* Well indeed might *Mr. Jevans* take alarm, lest even "*the shadow of a shade*" might not be left.

I had nearly forgotten to mention, what certainly ought not to be omitted, that in the paper of *Mr. Belsham* already alluded to, that writer has made a discovery of the true character of *sin-offerings,* which he represents to be nothing more than "*fines to the crown.*" (*M. Rep.* vol. ix. p. 754.) So that, to the several theories of sacrifice which have been brought under review in the second of the two *Discourses* in this work and the corresponding *Illustrations,* must now be added, at least so far as the Mosaic institution of sacrifice is concerned, this new one of *Mr. Belsham:* that, namely, of the sacrifice being a FINE; or as he expresses it, in relation to the Theocracy, "A FINE TO THE CROWN."

in which the Editors have departed from the translation of *Primate Newcome;* in which they have made no acknowledgment of the departure; and in which the departure is calculated to promote their peculiar opinions.—To proceed to a third instance of the same description.—

In Number III. we find the words, "HATH ASCENDED," used by the Unitarian Version in place of the Primate's rendering, "GOETH." This, however, is acknowledged. But we also find instead of the clause "who WAS in heaven," the following substituted, ["who IS in heaven."]—Now here the reader should be apprised, that, in addition to the obvious and important difference of the words "IS" and "WAS" in this passage, there is another most material one contained in the notation of the *brackets.* The *Primate* had stated in his preface (p. iv) that "he places between brackets, those words, to which *Griesbach* has prefixed a mark, denoting, that they should *probably*, though *not certainly*, be expunged." The Editors, who profess to follow *Newcome* throughout, agree with him in this notation likewise, stating the same thing that he has done, precisely. (Introd. p. xxxiii.) The brackets then appearing in the text before us, it is to be concluded, that they appear in *Newcome's;* and also, that, in the Greek text of *Griesbach*, there is found that particular mark, the existence of which the brackets were to indicate. But, the truth is, the Editors here differ directly from both the models which they profess to follow. The brackets are *not* in *Newcome.* And the mark is *not* in *Griesbach.* There is, on the contrary, another sort of mark found in *Griesbach*, indicating a very different character of the reading —"omissio *minus* probabilis:" (*Prolegom.* p. xc.)—a circumstance, which might in itself naturally have guarded even a heedless transcriber against the notation that has been used. We have here, then, in the body of the text, a declaration, that the clause in question is, to a *high degree of probability*, SPURIOUS: whilst *Griesbach* and *Newcome* ascribe to it no such character, and the latter presents it in a form carrying with it no mark of suspicion whatsoever. Are we

then to suppose this careful and significant demarcation by the brackets, to which nothing corresponding occurs in either *Griesbach* or *Newcome*, as well as the substitution of "IS" for "WAS,"—to have been, *both of them*, "slips of the pen, or errors of the press;" both occurring without the slightest notice of the variation; and both occurring together, in a clause of considerable moment in the Unitarian question, and one also to which a note is annexed relating both to the authenticity of the clause and to its meaning;—the attention of the Editors of course specially directed to both the points of difference, and yet neither of them glanced at by a single observation?

With the note itself, I have, strictly speaking, no concern. But, as tending to evince the great anxiety of the Editors to get rid of the words in the text altogether, and, consequently, as marking the importance they attach to them, the consideration of it becomes of value: inasmuch as the silent desertion of their professed models is thereby rendered the more obviously significant.—First, as a reason for affixing the mark of *highly probable spuriousness*, the note states, that "the clause is wanting in some of the best copies." Now, to come to direct matter of fact; *how many*, and *what* are these copies? The Editors have not chosen to put us in possession of this knowledge.—Upon the whole, *three:* and of these, one being so late as the 11th or 12th century, the testimony reduces nearly to the two remaining MSS. or perhaps, more properly speaking, (one of these being not earlier than the 8th, or probably the 9th, century,) to the single authority of the *Vatican*, a Manuscript undoubtedly of high antiquity. But the omission of the clause in these three MSS.[a], whilst it is found in *every other* unmutilated MS. of the great number referred to by *Griesbach*, can be of little weight in the mind of any real critic, and would have been met with derision by the Editors themselves, and set down

[a] The clause is wanting also in one Version, the *Ethiopic;* and in one of the Fathers, *Greg. Naz.* in a part of his works, whose genuineness has been questioned. *Every other Version*, however, and *every other Father*, who cites the passage, has the clause.

as a proof of the weakness of the cause it was advanced to support, had it been adduced as a reason for impeaching the authenticity of any passage of Scripture, that appeared to the Unitarians to sanction their notion [a] of the *proper humanity* of Christ.—However, labouring under misgivings, that this "*some of the best* copies," when examined into, might be found totally wanting in weight, the note, in the second place, proceeds to say of the clause in question.—"*If* its authenticity is allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge, which Christ possessed of his Father's will [b]. See

[a] Though in John i. 18, the very same authorities which have been here given, (excepting that of the *Vatican,*) joined with two *Syriac* Versions, (the *Peschito* and the *Philoxenian,*) and also the *Ethiopic,* and followed by a host of the Fathers from *Ignatius* downwards, support the reading of Θεὸς instead of υἱὸς, the Editors do not feel it necessary, upon the strength of these authorities, to give the name of GOD to *the only begotten of the Father.*—Such is the consistency and impartiality of these inquirers after revealed truth!

[b] We find a reference here made to John i. 18. Now it is whimsical enough, that on John i. 18, (where the participle occurs exactly as it does here, ὁ ὤν,) the Editors state in their note, that "who *was*" is preferable to "who *is*:" although they *here* depart from *Newcome,* in changing "*was*" to "*is.*" Thus even their own references support each other. They change the *past* into the *present;* and then refer to a passage where they say the *present* ought to be changed into the *past.*—But, let this go with the rest.—As to the departure from *Newcome* in this particular, they will probably tell us, that although they have here departed from him, yet they have only given us the rendering of the Received Version. True—but they pledged themselves, *in all cases,* either to abide by *Newcome,* or to give notice of the departure. Again, they may pretend, that, in their change of the *past* into the *present,* they could not at all events be supposed to have sought any advantage to their cause; as, by this, they but coincide with the *Received Version.* But when they have themselves told us, in a passage which they admit to be precisely parallel, that the *past* is the true interpretation, they compel us to look for some special reason for their abandoning it, when it was presented to them by their own model. This reason it will not be difficult to discover, when it is recollected that the object with the Editors of this new version is, not merely to defeat the doctrines of Trinitarians, but also those of all denominations of Christians that lie in the graduations of the scale between the station of Trinitarians and that part (below the freezing point) where these new-light Unitarians choose to place themselves;—all, in short, that attribute to our blessed Lord any quality that would raise him above that meagre skeleton, which these writers present to us in his stead. Now, it is obvious, that, in the *literal* sense of the word "*heaven,*" the *past time* is necessarily connected with the opinions of all these; and even to the unreflecting mass of Trinitarian believers it might be supposed to appear rather startling, to speak of our Lord, at the same time that he was addressing the Jews in a human form, as being at that very time actually in heaven. And, accordingly, Unitarians have not failed to press this as a difficulty quite insuperable. The *present tense* is therefore preferred by

John i. 18"—that is, the idea of our Lord's being, or having been, actually in heaven, is to be got rid of at all events.—The passage is spurious:—or, if that point cannot be carried, then comes the gloss—the words, "WHO IS IN HEAVEN,"—"are to be understood of the knowledge which Christ possessed of his Father's will;"—or, as it is given in due form by *Mr. Belsham*, (who is employed throughout his *Calm Inquiry*, in giving full and fair shape and proportion to the crude conceptions of the Editors,)—"WHO IS INSTRUCTED IN THE GRACIOUS PURPOSES OF GOD TO MAN." (p. 53.) Thus, they who tell us, that the entire investigation of Scripture truth requires only "a sound understanding and an honest mind," and that learning and subtlety are "by no means necessary to settle the important question concerning the person of Christ, the inquiry being into a plain matter of fact," (*Calm Inq.* p. 5,)—contend, that the *plain and obvious meaning* (of course) of the words, "WHO IS IN HEAVEN," is, WHO IS INSTRUCTED IN THE GRACIOUS PURPOSES OF GOD TO MAN.

What degree of value the Editors attach to the due *managing* of the passage, it will not be difficult to infer from what has been said. But we are not left to inference upon this subject. The truth is, that this passage, and those[a] that

the Editors, manifestly with good policy, as leading so many classes of Christians to relinquish the literal sense of the passage for that figurative one, which they propose, and which is essential to their system. Thus *Mr. Lindsey* says, on the words "who is in heaven,"—"these *cannot* be taken literally: for the *Son of Man* could not be in heaven *at the same time* that he was upon earth: it is *therefore* (he adds) to be considered (like John i. 18) as metaphorical language," signifying, "the being admitted into the secret councils of God." (*Second Address*, p. 60. *Sequel*, p. 218.) Thus the *present tense* was indispensable to the Unitarian designs upon this verse of John. But it is only in the minds of such as do not clearly discern the real doctrines of Scripture, that any difficulty can be raised from reading the words in the present tense. For, whether we take the words in the sense in which *Campbell* uses them, as representing our Lord as saying, that *heaven is the place of his abode;* or as stating (with *Doddridge*) that *even then, whilst he was speaking, he was actually present in heaven by his divine nature which fills both heaven and earth;*—the whole comes but to the plain declaration of that which is asserted in almost every page of the New Testament; namely, that our *Lord Jesus Christ* was at the same time both GOD AND MAN.

[a] I subjoin here a few of the passages connected with this particular subject, together with the glosses of the Unitarian Editors.

speak a similar language in the sixth chapter of John, have always puzzled Unitarian writers more than almost any other

John i. 18. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

Common Version.

No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

Unitarian Gloss.

"No one knows the purposes of God, but his faithful servant and messenger, Jesus Christ, who is instructed in his counsels, and has revealed his will." *Calm. Inq.* p. 53.

John iii. 13. Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

Common Version.

And no man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, [even] the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.

Unitarian Gloss.

"No one has ever been admitted to a participation of the divine counsels, except the Son of Man, Jesus of Nazareth, who has been commissioned to reveal the will of God to men, and who is perfectly instructed and qualified for this office." *Calm Inq.* p. 53.

John iii. 31. Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν. Ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ· ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί.

Common Version.

He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all.

Unitarian Gloss.

"He who cometh with a divine commission is superior to all: he, who is of the earth, manifests the origin of his teaching, and his words have not their requisite authority. He, who cometh with a divine commission, is superior to all." *Calm Inq.* p. 55. *Unit. the Doct., &c.*, p. 261.

John vi. 38. Καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Common Version.

I came down from heaven.

Unitarian Gloss.

"My doctrines and mission are of divine authority." *Calm Inq.* p. 60. *Imp. Vers.* p. 219.

John vi. 62. Ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα, ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον;

Common Version.

What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?

Unitarian Gloss.

"What if ye shall see the Son of Man displaying a still more intimate acquaintance with the purposes of God, and revealing truths which would be

in the New Testament. Of the text before us *Mr. Belsham* confesses that it "is a text, the right understanding of which

still more remote from your apprehensions, and offensive to your prejudices? (*Unit. the Doct.*, &c., p. 254.)"—or as Mr. Belsham has it,—"go farther out of your reach, and become still more perplexing and mysterious?" *Calm. Inq.* p. 67.

On the last text Mr. Belsham remarks, that our Lord had purposely employed "enigmatical discourse" in this place, that he might offend and repel his selfish hearers: and that, in the 63d verse, he desires them to look to the "hidden meaning" contained in it as the only thing useful. Thus we see, that the "inquiry into a plain matter of fact," (*Calm Inq.* p. 5,) turns out, when Mr. Belsham pleases, the investigation of the *hidden meanings* of the *enigmatical* discourses of our Lord, which at times he purposely rendered still more *perplexing* and *mysterious*: and this, it must be observed, not merely for the purpose of misleading those whom he immediately addressed, but with the certain effect of misleading thousands and tens of thousands of sincere and humble followers. For even down to the present day, under the supposition that our Lord's words meant what they plainly express, do we not find that the Christian world has remained altogether unacquainted with the hidden meaning of the last important text; and might indeed remain for ages yet to come unacquainted with it, were it not, that Mr. Belsham has, as he informs us himself, for the first time made the discovery? And, unfortunately, even now that he has made it, the interpretation, he tells us, is so "different from the plain meaning of the words," that it will be "called a forced" one, and will, therefore, most probably, after all be rejected by the unmanageable common sense of the world. Le Clerc, it is true, he admits, "seems to have hinted at something similar;" but the actual full discovery of it has been reserved for himself. At the same time he proposes it, (as he *avers*,) with great "diffidence:" and his respect for St. John is such, that he seems glad that "there is no occasion to have recourse" (like Dr. Priestley) "to the supposition of a lapse of memory in the Evangelist." (*Calm Inq.* p. 65.) His hidden meaning has enabled him to *get rid* of the inference of our Lord's pre-existence, *without* that supposition. One thing undoubtedly must be admitted, that whatever be the *mystery* here, Mr. Belsham is the best entitled to explain it: for it has been, all of it, his own creation. The powers of language cannot give greater plainness: nor can any powers of confounding language that this writer may call to his aid, (and scarcely any can be greater than those he has here employed,) involve our Lord's words in the slightest perplexity. *Mr. Lindsey*, from whom Mr. Belsham has copied most of his expositions of Scripture, had been rather unfortunate in his experiments on this passage: for having admitted that our Lord spoke here of his *actual ascension into heaven* which was to take place after his death, he was obviously bound to explain the words "*where he was before*" *in reference to the* same place, and so to admit our Lord's *previous existence in heaven*. But as *this* was by no means to be conceded, he was obliged to make the relative, (whose force the word *where* possesses,) mean something different from its own antecedent. "When you shall see me go up *to heaven*, to God (alluding to his

is of *great importance* in settling the controversy concerning the pre-existence of Christ." (*Calm Inq.* p. 40.) The cor-

future ascension) *where I was before;* i. e. from whom I have received my instructions and authority." (*Sequel*, &c., p. 221.) This was too monstrous. It was too open a subversion of the principles of language. *Mr. Belsham*, therefore, seeing no way for him in this direction, was driven upon the wonderful discovery which he has made.

I do not mean to enter into a formal exposure of the Unitarian glosses that have been cited. They sufficiently expose themselves. I have adduced them merely to show to what sad straits Unitarians are reduced, in their endeavours to escape from the force of plain Scripture language; and what consequence they attach to every circumstance, however minute, that may enable them to fritter away the evidence of our Lord's *pre-existence*, *Bishop Burgess*, in his excellent Tract, to which I have already frequently referred, has exhibited various other such glosses, and observed upon them with the ability and learning which belong to him. (*The Bible*, &c., pp. 68—96.) *Dr. Nares*, also, in his *Remarks*, (2d Ed. pp. 102—109,) has judiciously exhibited the weakness and inconsistency of the principle, on which these glosses are attempted to be sustained. With respect to the true and undoubted meaning of the passages themselves, that has been so firmly established, and placed upon such an immovable foundation by all the great commentators who have treated of them, that as for the idle attempt of the unlearned and sophistical critics of the Unitarian School to disturb it by their expositions, (and by *such* expositions,) they might as well indulge in the hope of shaking St. Paul's with a breath. I shall therefore detain the reader with but a few remarks: and these, not for the useless purpose of defending texts that do not require defence against such criticisms, but for one which I conceive to be more important,—that of making him a little better acquainted with the absurdity of the criticisms, and the incompetency of the Critics.

On John iii. 13, it is observed by the Editors of the Unitarian Version, and enforced with much emphasis by *Mr. Belsham* and *Dr. Carpenter*, that to "*ascend into heaven*," signifies "to become acquainted with the truths of God:"—and that, consequently, the "correlative" to this, (the *opposite*, they should have said,) to "*descend from heaven*," must mean "to bring and to discover those truths to the world." *Imp. Vers.* p. 253. *Calm Inq.* p. 48. *Unit. the Doct.*, &c., p. 253. Now, allowing these gentlemen all they wish to establish as to the first clause,—that *to go up into heaven*, means *to learn and become acquainted with the counsels of God*,—what must follow, if they reasoned justly upon their own principles? Plainly this, that *to come down from heaven*, being precisely the *opposite* of the former, must mean to *unlearn or to lose the knowledge of those counsels:* so that, so far from *bringing and discovering* those counsels to mankind, our Lord must have *disqualified* himself for bringing any. Had, indeed, "ASCENDING *into heaven*" meant "BRINGING the truth (anywhere) FROM men," then "DESCENDING *from heaven*" might justly be said to mean "BRINGING it back TO men." Whatever, in short, ASCENDING may be supposed to signify *in any figure*, DESCENDING must signify the *opposite* if *the figure be abided by:* and, therefore, if to ASCEND be to *learn*, to DESCEND must be to *unlearn*. When *Æschines*, in the picture of the *Theban* calamities, which he presents to the *Athenians*, speaks of the misery of their being reduced μεταμανθάνειν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, he clearly conveys the idea of the *opposite* of *learning* liberty. Had he been told by a Unitarian Critic, (the hypothetical anachronism will I

responding text in John vi. 62, he also admits, has always been considered as "the palmary argument for the pre-ex-

hope be pardoned,) that that *opposite*, instead of being to *unlearn*, or *lose the knowledge* of liberty, was to *bring* and *spread the knowledge* of it everywhere, he would have found himself sadly mistaken in the force of that fine expression with which he meant so powerfully to work upon the feelings of his countrymen. *Mr. Belsham*, indeed, contents himself with *asserting*, that "the figure is preserved, if the person spoken of *ascends* to *learn* heavenly truths, and *descends* to *communicate* them." (*Calm Inq.* p. 51.) Now can any conceivable meaning be assigned to this? *Ascends, whither?*—nowhere. *Descends whence?*—from no place. The "figure then is preserved" by using the *words* "ascend" and "descend" when there is neither *ascending* nor *descending*. *Mr. Belsham* and the Editors for the word *ascend* read *learn*, and for *descend* read *communicate;* and yet would *retain* the *words* in the very figure that has *dismissed* them. Let them admit an actual *ascending* and *descending*, and then, indeed, the *opposition* is preserved, but the *figure* is gone, be the *objects* of the ascent and descent what they may. Thus these critics employ the words *at the same time* in a literal and in a figurative sense. If we say, you destroy the opposition; then they present the words *ascend* and *descend* literally. If we say, then you grant an actual *ascent* and *descent;* they immediately tell us they use the words but figuratively.—"Quo tenear"—? *To communicate* is manifestly *not the opposite* of *to learn:* so far from it, that in the Hebrew language it would be actually considered but as a different conjugation of the verb: thus *Hiphil* converts the verb בין from the one sense to the other, and the verb למד is everywhere applied to both indifferently. In the true sense of the word *communicate*, or *teach*, which is to *cause others to learn*, if "the figure were properly preserved," it would be said, not that our Lord *descended from heaven*, but that he *made others to ascend thither*, as he had done himself.

Lud. Raphelius, who was, indeed, a scholar and a reasoner, and therefore knew how to give to all these considerations their proper weight, felt it impossible, although he had been led to admit the figurative meaning of the first clause, to allow it to the second. "Facile quisquam in has cogitationes incidere posset, ut putet, si ASCENDERE IN CŒLUM idem sit, quod SCIRE mysteria divina, *oppositum* DESCENDERE idem fore quod NESCIRE." (See his Preface to his Father's Annotations, § 17.) And accordingly, this writer, whose knowledge enabled him to perceive that the objection was *vital*, and could not, consistently with any sound principle either of criticism or logic, be overturned, did not hesitate to reply to it, that the *second* clause was to be taken *literally;* nothing being more usual than that two words of opposite import should be taken, in the same sentence, the one in a *figurative*, and the other in a *literal* sense. In this he repeats the opinion of another distinguished critic; and out of the examples which, he says, abound in the Sacred Writings, he thinks it necessary to adduce but one, from 1 Thess. v. 4, 5. 7, 8, in which the words *day* and *night* are manifestly used in this manner. *Mr. Belsham*, however, directly contradicts the position of *Raphelius;* and asserts, that in the passage before us, "if the first clause is figurative, the second is figurative; and if the first is literal, the second is literal." (*Calm Inq.* p. 50.) So say the Editors (of whom *Mr. Belsham* is one) with increased emphasis. (*Imp. Vers.* pp. 208. 226.) This in truth they deem the great strength of their cause: and it is on this principle that they confess that they are enabled to explain away the meaning of the phrase *descend*

istence." (p. 64.) And, accordingly, he labours with all his *from heaven*, "WHEREVER IT OCCURS" throughout the writings of St. John. (*Imp. Vers.* p. 208.) As this, then, is a main point, *Mr. Belsham* is careful not to admit the instance adduced by *Raphelius* as sufficient; and demands more examples, before he will consent to relinquish this essential canon of Unitarian criticism. Now I should certainly not hesitate to comply with *Mr. Belsham's* demand, by supplying the examples he requires, but that he and his brother editors have saved me all trouble upon that head, by producing sufficient from their own stores, bearing, also, upon the very question before us, John xiii. 3, and xvi. 28, they translate, "He *came from God*, and was *going to God:*" and "I *came forth from the Father*, and am *come into the world:* again I *leave the world* and *go to the Father.*" The note of the Editors on the former verse, and consequently upon the latter, (in which they refer to the former with which it corresponds,) thus explains the second clause—"he was *going to God*, to *give an account of his charge:* his public mission and ministry being ended." That is; the Editors take the words of the *second* clause *literally*, of our Lord's departure from the world; and yet they at the same time insist on the *figurative* application of the *first* clause, as in reference to their sense of the words in John i. 6.—*Mr. Lindsey*, also, (the favourite expositor of the Unitarians,) in like manner with the Editors, takes the two corresponding clauses in these verses, the one in a figurative and the other in a literal sense: and for the purpose of justifying his use of the words "*coming into the world*" in a *figurative sense*, whilst the words "*leaving the world*" must be taken in a *literal* one, he adds, that "it is frequent with the best authors, and the *sacred writers in particular*, when the same words are put in opposition to each other, to take the *one* in a *literal* and the *other in a figurative* sense:" and in support of this he instances, besides the passage in 1 Thess. already adduced from Raphelius, Matt. viii. 22. (See *Comment. and Essays*, vol. i. pp. 395, 396.)

Now, I must beg the reader's attention to this assertion of *Mr. Lindsey*, as tending to supply us with a direct proof of a degree of unfairness in *Mr. Belsham's* treatment of this subject, to which I should be unwilling to give the true appellation. He had, as we have seen, pronounced the single instance adduced by *Raphelius* insufficient to establish his position; and had observed upon *Raphelius's* assertion that examples were numerous,—"it is singular, that, if examples are so numerous, only one should be produced:" (p. 51:) clearly intimating that he knew of no other that could be advanced in behalf of *Raphelius's* opinion. Now, independently of those two very important examples which the Unitarian Editors (himself included in the number) have supplied, we find him (at p. 104 of his *Calm Inq.*) actually refer to the very example quoted by *Mr. Lindsey;* and repeat his very words, which have been just cited, in support of the admission of both the figurative and the literal sense in the contrasted clauses. *Mr. Belsham*, then, *knew* of other examples besides that one adduced by *Raphelius!* and yet speaks and argues as if he *did not;* and draws his conclusions, and establishes his canon, on the ground that none other *could* be adduced. Is this the love of truth which belongs to Unitarians? Long may such truth be the "*aversion*" of the Clergy of that Church, which he indecently and presumptuously reviles! It is no apology for *Mr. Belsham*, that he is desperately pushed in this case, and that unless he can establish his canon, all is over with Unitarianism, and the doctrine of the pre-existence rises triumphant. He will not content himself with begging quarter, like *Mr. Lindsey*, when, after

might through no less than eight and twenty pages of the struggling in vain to extricate himself from the meshes of that net in John vi. 62, in which all Unitarians are caught, he ends his fruitless endeavours with saying, — "But should we not have been able to develope its meaning, will any be so injudicious as to say, that one obscure passage concerning Christ," (so obscure as simply to say that our Lord was to *ascend where he had been before*,) "is to be set up against the whole stream and tenor of the Scripture declarations concerning him?" (*Second Address*, p. 71.) This, it will be readily admitted, is a decided confession on the part of *Mr. Lindsey*, that he is not able to divest this passage of a sense which establishes the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. However, as he finds it so intractable, he brands it as "*obscure*," (as well might he speak of the darkness of a sun-beam,) and then half-supplicates, that it may not be urged in support of a doctrine which it unequivocally announces; threatening at the same time to call any person "injudicious" who shall give it this obvious application.

Mr. Belsham, however, does not seem to think the terror of this imputation a sufficient safeguard; and therefore deems it more prudent not to make any such confession as *Mr. Lindsey* has made, lest an ungenerous use might be made of it. He saw that *Mr. Lindsey* had been brought into his difficulties, by allowing, in two antithetical clauses, a figurative interpretation of the one and a literal interpretation of the other; and therefore he was resolved, at all events, *per fas et nefas*, to maintain the canon, that requires *both* to be taken *literally*, or *both figuratively*. So he and the Editors put the canon, *pro formâ*, with an air of great impartiality: but as they have in truth turned almost the entire of the N. T. into figure, the latter member of the canon being what they really held in view, the former they might as well have omitted. They are undoubtedly somewhat puzzled in the application of this rule to the passages in John xiii. 3, and xvi. 28: and, as I have already mentioned, the Editors actually desert the canon here, if their words have any meaning. But *Mr. Belsham*, when he stands single and detached from his brother Editors, takes a different ground, and, with a hardihood that falls to the lot of few, (and that might almost tempt one to exclaim with Horace, "O te Bollane cerebri felicem,") at once removes the difficulty, by asserting that *all is to be taken figuratively*. "As Jesus *came into* the world, when he appeared in public as a messenger from God; so, conversely, he *left the world*, and *returned to the Father*, when his mission closed, and he ceased to appear any longer as a public teacher." (*Calm Inq.* p. 104.) So that, in *Mr. Belsham's* idea, our Lord *left the world* only *in a figure*; as a person is said to leave the world, who retires from public life. Our Lord then means nothing, in reality, of *leaving the world* and *going to the Father*, when he says he is about to do so. *Mr. Belsham*, I believe, stands the single writer in the whole world (unless, *possibly*, Dr. Carpenter, whose meaning I do not quite understand, may agree with him) that could venture such an assertion. The thing is too clear for doubt. All commentators of whatever description, Arian and Socinian, as well as Trinitarian, have hitherto, however they might endeavour to explain it, uniformly admitted that our Lord spoke literally of his leaving the world, and going to the Father. But *Mr. Belsham* says, they are all wrong —it is no such thing—"it is better to take both clauses figuratively." And this is precisely his *proof*: neither more nor less. "IT IS BETTER." Why? Simply because it is better to degrade the *Son of God*, the *Saviour of the world*, to the condition of mere man. *Mr. Belsham* has nowhere assigned any other reason, why "IT IS BETTER."

most extraordinary quagmire in which any person pretend-

—As the *Monthly Review* will not be suspected of any extravagant leaning to orthodoxy, I will quote here a passage from it upon this subject.—"When, however, the coming *from* is contrasted with the return of Christ *to* the Father, as in John xvi. 28, where the obvious meaning of his words is, 'I left the Father to come to you; again I leave you to go to the Father,' it seems *impossible to evade the inference*, that Christ existed before his appearance amongst men." (vol. lxviii. p. 271.) In contending, that all here is *figure, Mr. Belsham*, it should be observed, not only flies in the face of the common sense of mankind, but he directly contradicts the declaration of the Scripture itself upon this head. "His disciples say unto him, 'So now thou speakest *plainly*, and speakest *no dark speech*;'" no figure of speech, but language in its plain, obvious, and literal acceptation. So little did the disciples imagine, that, when our Lord informed them that he was about to *leave the world and go to the Father*, he meant to say that he was *not* to leave the world and go to the Father, at all! But *Mr. Belsham* is used to set but little value on the judgment of an Apostle. *Priestley, Lindsey*, or *Cappe*, have more weight with him at all times than *Peter, Paul*, or *John*; and display infinitely a clearer and more unprejudiced perception of the truths of revelation.

We have seen that *Mr. Belsham* strenuously maintains, that "ascending into heaven" merely signifies *knowing the divine counsels:* that when our Lord describes himself as "coming down from heaven," and again as "ascending up where he was before," he means only, by the first, that he *had a divine authority;* and by the second, that, "*having spoken what had given offence, he would go on to speak things still more perplexing and offensive to his hearers;*" and that, when he talks of "leaving the world and going to the Father," he intends simply to announce the *finishing of his ministry*. After a lengthened review of the various passages in which these and similar expressions occur, a review extending through more than a hundred pages, *Mr. Belsham* is found congratulating himself on his success in proving, that these, and such phrases, wherever they occur, mean nothing whatever of that which they express; neither of *going into heaven*, nor of *coming from heaven*, nor of *going to the Father;* but that they plainly and solely relate to the *learning and revealing the divine purposes*. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 152.) So extended an examination of texts of Scripture *Mr. Belsham* had however rendered in a great measure unnecessary; for, by his knowledge of Astronomy he pronounces himself entitled to assert, that no such thing as a local heaven can possibly exist. This is "a puerile hypothesis," which the "modern discoveries in Astronomy" enable him to laugh to scorn. What these "modern discoveries in Astronomy" are, *Mr. Belsham* has not informed us. Not only his Morals and his Theology have been given to the world, but his Logics and Metaphysics also have been vouchsafed to us, together with a slight specimen of his Mathematics. What a pity that his Astronomical discoveries have not likewise been made known! It must, indeed, be observed, that he feels himself so strong upon the *just and natural views* of Scripture language which he has presented to the reader, that he voluntarily forbears to lay that stress upon this *à priori demonstration*, which the cogency of his Astronomical proofs would, it is to be supposed, have justified, had he produced them. To explain the matter more fully, he adds, that the whole of the idea of a "local heaven" is an "absurd Jewish notion," for that "God is at all times equally and everywhere present: and heaven is a *state*, and not a *place*, and that to be perfectly virtuous and perfectly

ing to criticism ever plunged, for the purpose of removing,

happy is to be in heaven, whatever be the local situation of the being in question." (p. 55.) It must follow of course, that *being in heaven*, or *ascending into heaven*, considered locally, can be no other than a gross absurdity, and of course can never be the meaning of Scripture, under any form of expression however unequivocal. To direct *Mr. Belsham's* attention to the numerous passages, throughout the Old and the New Testament, in which the idea of a local heaven is explicitly conveyed, would be vain. To direct his attention to *Bishop Burgess's* remarks upon this subject in his *Letter to the Bishop of Gloucester*, (pp. 15—17,) would be equally vain. But I should be glad to learn, in what manner *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors would dispose of the passage in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; and in what sense they would set about explaining our Lord's *descent from heaven* as it is there described, on which they have in their comment taken good care to preserve a profound silence.

But, having seen that *Mr. Belsham* has established by his Criticism that the words "ascending into heaven," *do not* mean "ascending into heaven," and by his Astronomy that they *cannot* mean it, what shall we say, if we find this very writer contending, on another occasion, for this very ascension of our Lord in a *literal* sense; and contending for it, in a part of Scripture, where there are no words to express it; and where, in truth, it is manifest, almost to demonstration, that no such thing has been intended? The passage I allude to is 1 Pet. iii. 19, in which the simple expression Πορευθεὶς, *having gone*, *Mr. Belsham* asserts, is to be understood of our Lord's *ascension into heaven*, "postquam in cœlum ascendit," as he adopts from *Grotius*. Thus the mere word which signifies to *go*, is made to convey that *ascent into heaven*, which the same word, when coupled with *the Father*, (*I go to the Father*, πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,) and even the very phrase *go up into heaven*, are not allowed to signify; and which, from astronomical proofs, it is averred, they *could not* signify. — *Dr. Carpenter*, whose criticism and science both coincide with those of *Mr. Belsham*, in depriving the several passages that speak of our Lord's *going up into heaven*, and of his *descending from heaven*, of any signification, or the possibility of any signification, at all connected with the actual ascent and descent which they literally express, (*Unit. the Doct.*, &c., pp. 256, 257,) coincides with him likewise in attributing to the simple word πορευθεὶς, in this passage of 1 Peter, the idea of an *actual ascension into heaven*. See *Unit. the Doct.*, &c., p. 227; to which page I would refer the reader for one of the most complete specimens of Unitarian exposition to be met with in the same narrow compass; it seldom happening, that it is necessary, even for the Unitarian, to disturb the just meaning of *every* word in an entire passage of Scripture; which is almost literally the case here. The violent departure from all principles of criticism and grammar in the explanation given of it by the Unitarians is perhaps their best refutation. The remarks of *Bishop Burgess* on the passage itself, and on the Unitarian treatment of it, are well worthy of attention; and particularly his animadversions on the unfair use made of *Schleusner's* name by *Dr. Carpenter;* by whom the authority of that writer has been applied to give countenance to that interpretation of the passage which he directly opposes. (*The Bible*, &c., pp. 87, 88.) With the sense of the text itself, which has been again and again abundantly established beyond the reach of Unitarian cavil, and on which *Bishop Burgess* and *Dr. Nares* have recently referred to the best sources of interpretation, I mean not to concern myself. My object is merely to show how Unitarian critics proceed in their treatment of Scripture, asserting and

or overlaying, that obnoxious sense[a], which, until the present day, had been given to these passages by Christians of *all parties and denominations*, *Socinians* themselves even not excepted. At the same time, we find, at the conclusion of his labours, the confession fairly made, that the interpretation which he had been toiling to establish "will be called a *forced* interpretation; and that it is certainly very different from the plain literal meaning of the words." (p. 67.) However, it is an interpretation, which recommends itself most strongly to *Mr. Belsham*, by its efficacy in clearing away from a part of Scripture which had been *hitherto supposed to speak expressly* of our Lord's pre-existence, and to contain allusions to his death, his atonement, and the institution of the Eucharist, every notion connected with these subjects. (p. 68.) Whatever tended to smooth the way to an interpretation productive of such vast advantages to the Unitarian cause, so vast as to strike at the foundation of the great essential truths of Christianity, must have been acceptable; and, therefore, the (*unnoticed*) departure from the *Primate* and *Griesbach*, in John iii. 13, was, to say the least of it, not unseasonable.—To go now to the fourth instance.

retracting; raising up and throwing down; demonstrating the impossibility of a certain thing at one time, and grounding arguments on the familiar assumption of this very thing at another; and all simply referred to the one standard, "IT IS BETTER;" that is, it corresponds better with the Unitarian theory that has been laid down, antecedent and paramount to Scripture; and by which, being *established* by REASON, (so at least they tell us,) Scripture is in all cases to be judged. Thus our Lord's ASCENSION is to be let in here, where it is *not* spoken of; and to be rejected in other places, where it *is* spoken of: and both for the same reason. Our Lord's pre-existence is evaded in the one place by the *admission*, and in the others by the *rejection*. "IT IS BETTER," therefore, as *Mr. Belsham* says, to act thus in these several places respectively.

[a] It must be observed, that the *sense* I speak of here is the *primary* sense of the words implying a *local ascent and descent*, and a *real heaven;* which the *old Socinians* (as has been adverted to p. 59, vol. i. of this work) applied to the notion of our Lord's being taken up into heaven after his baptism: so that, whilst they admitted the plain and obvious meaning of the words, they avoided the inference of the *pre-existence*. Socinians, again, of a later day, speak of our Lord's being in heaven as a matter of *vision*, (like that of St. Paul,) which he had not been able to distinguish from reality. But, however they might explain the matter subsequently, none ever attempted to clear away the meaning of the words altogether in the first instance, as the Unitarians of the present day have done.

In Number IV. we find the passage in Rom. ix. 5, which is generally admitted to contain one of the most direct and forcible declarations of our Lord's divinity, that can be instanced throughout the entire of the New Testament. *Michaelis* does not hesitate to assert, in terms the most unqualified, that "Paul here delivers the same doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which is elsewhere unquestionably maintained in the New Testament." *Dr. Doddridge*, in his comment on the place, describes it as "a memorable text, containing a proof of Christ's proper deity, which the opposers of that doctrine have never been able, nor will ever be able, to answer." The learned continuators of *Poole's Annotations* affirm this to be "the fullest place to express the TWO NATURES that are in the person of our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, who was *God* as well as *Man*." *Storr* says of this passage, that it attributes the divine nature to Christ in terms the most unequivocal[a], "Divinam naturam *disertissime*

[a] *Commentationes Theologicæ*, vol. i. p. 224. I the more willingly refer to this observation of *Storr*, because it affords an opportunity for directing the reader's attention to the valuable essay containing it; in which it is satisfactorily shown, that the reading of ὃς for Θεὸς in Tim. iii. 16, an alteration which the Unitarians are so extremely anxious to accomplish, would, were it even conceded to them, afford to their cause not the slightest advantage; inasmuch as the meaning of the passage would remain perfectly unaffected by it, and the divinity of Christ would stand upon ground as firm as if the word Θεὸς were the received reading of the text. See *Comm. Theol.* vol. i. p. 219—240. *Cramer*, it should be observed, has in a different manner arrived at the same result, by making Θεοῦ ζῶντος the antecedent to ὃς, the intervening words being included in a parenthesis See *Woide's Preface to the Cod. Alex. of the N. T.* p. xxxii.

On this text I must notice an observation made by the Editors of the Unitarian Version, which will show with what disingenuous vagueness they express themselves on subjects of Scripture criticism, and will prove to the unlearned reader how little confidence he should place in any of their positions. Of the two passages, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 John v. 7, they affirm, that they have obtained "a full proof that THESE TEXTS were not to be found in any manuscripts existing," (before the fifth century,) "and therefore that THEY are certainly SPURIOUS." *Introd.* p. xviii. Having spoken of these two texts here in precisely the same terms, and pronounced them to be equally spurious, who would not conclude, that, as they have endeavoured to prove the entire passage in John to have been an interpolation, they mean to affirm the same thing of the other, and that, consequently, no part of it had a place in the genuine text of Scripture: whilst, after all, there is nothing more contended for, than the various reading of a single word; and that, a reading under which the sense of the passage may remain perfectly unaltered? In the more critical part of their work, they endea-

tribuit." Both *Grotius* and *Rosenmüller*, it has been remarked before, at p. 133 of this volume, observe, upon the vour to show, that the word ὃς should be read for Θεὸς; and in the part where they address themselves to the general reader, they pronounce the *text* to be altogether *spurious!* How very differently has *Dr. Clarke* conducted himself upon this subject! Having arrived at the same conclusion with that of the Editors, that the ancient reading was ὃς, not Θεὸς, he adds, "But it is not in reality of great importance: for the sense is evident; that that Person was manifest in the flesh, whom St. John in the beginning of his Gospel styles [Θεὸς] God." *Clarke's Works*, vol. iv. p. 48. The Editors, who in p. 484, have, to procure the authority of this writer's name, quoted him, up to the very sentence that has now been cited, found it convenient to close their quotation at the point where this begins.

It is whimsical enough, that a decided and zealous Unitarian has lately taken up the defence of the received reading Θεὸς in this passage, on the ground both of strict criticism and ancient authorities; and that he does not scruple to charge *Griesbach*, who proposes the substitution of ὃς, with a corruption of the text, and a total ignorance of the Greek language. He goes so far, indeed, as to assert of *Griesbach*, "that implicit confidence is to be reposed neither in his judgment as a critic, nor in his fidelity as an assertor of facts:" and speaking of his elaborate note in support of the reading of ὃς, "engages to show that he has proved nothing" (in that) "but his own incompetence as a critic, and his want of fidelity as a collator of the ancient copies." This writer, accordingly, proceeds to argue, that neither the genius of the Greek, the sense of the Apostle, nor the authority of the ancient Fathers, will admit any other reading than Θεὸς. See *Monthly Repository*, vol. ix. pp. 120—123. I have mentioned this writer's remarks, more especially for the purpose of reminding the Unitarian Editors, that there are persons who, although *not* "tied down—to a system of Theology, the wretched relic of a dark and barbarous age, on the profession and defence of which all their hopes are built," but even enjoying the pure light of Unitarian illumination, and free as air in the formation of their opinions, are yet of opinion, that, notwithstanding all that has been so laboriously urged against the received reading of the text, *it* and it only is the true one; and of reminding them, also, that, when this is the case, it may be deemed a little too bold to pronounce on the proposed change, as one so clearly and certainly to be admitted, that the existing text is peremptorily to be rejected as *spurious*.—To pass from the Unitarian Editors to inquirers of a more impartial description, I would recommend it to such as may be desirous of forming a sound judgment on *Griesbach's* critical investigation of the reading of the text, to consult *Dr. Laurence's* learned and valuable *Remarks upon Griesbach's Classification*, pp. 72—84. The observations also in the *British Critic*, (New Series,) vol. i. pp. 403—422, deserve to be attended to. See *Pearson on the Creed*, p. 128, and *Whitby* in locum. It should be remarked, that they, who oppose the primitive reading of Θεὸς, are not agreed amongst themselves, what word should be substituted in its place. *Griesbach* contends for ὃς: *Sir Isaac Newton* for ὁ. The persons, who follow either confidently, must hold themselves entitled to brand the other with the reading of a "*spurious*" text in the very same degree, in which the Unitarian Editors are justified in charging it against those who prefer the word Θεὸς to either. Having mentioned this last distinguished name, I must beg of the reader to attend to the remarks made by *Bishop Horsley* upon that writer's celebrated treatise on this text, at pp. 532.

words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, that St. Paul meant to point out that he here spoke of our Lord, "not according to the *divine* but according to the *human* nature which existed in him." *Whitby*, in his comment upon this verse, expressly asserts [a], that "FROM THE BEGINNING these words have been used by the Fathers, as an argument of Christ's Divinity." And, in truth, there is, perhaps, no single text in the whole of the N. T. in which the divinity and the twofold nature of our Lord are laid down more unequivocally, and more indisputably as to the wording of the original, than they are in this. It is, therefore, not without good reason that the opposers of our Lord's divinity have always considered this text as presenting the most formidable impediment to the admission of their doctrines; and they have accordingly invented various strange devices, and conjectural modifications of the passage, in order if possible to escape from its force. Of all these our Unitarian Editors [b], as usual, have availed themselves: but,

549, vol. v. of the Bishop's edition of *Newton's* works: and especially the remark, at the former of these pages, on *Chrysostom's* testimony.

[a] This quotation from *Whitby* affords an opportunity of remarking on the danger of placing implicit reliance on the generality of writers in their reference to authorities. In a book of some degree of note, *Bowyer's Conjectures on the New Testament*, we find the assertion here made by *Whitby*, contrasted, as presenting a remarkable opposition, to one made by *Mills* on the same subject: viz. "that NO ONE of all the Catholic Fathers EVER ALLEGED the text before the year 380. *Gregory Nyssen* first of all." This assertion of *Mills* the writer quotes from *Dr. Clarke*, by whom it had been applied, not to this, but to the text 1 Tim. iii. 16, to which it had been applied by *Mills*. This text in Timothy, however, happening to fall in the same page of *Clarke's Works* with the observations on Rom. ix. 5; and the note in *Clarke*, which contains the quotation from *Mills*, being marked by the same sort of asterisk that had been introduced for quite another object into those observations; the eye of the compiler was wrongly directed, whilst his judgment and knowledge were not sufficient to correct the mistake; and, therefore, from a mere visus deceptio, he has given, as applied by *Dr. Clarke* to Rom. ix. 5, what that writer had connected with 1 Tim. iii. 16.—See *Bowyer's Conjectures*, p. 260, and *Clarke's Works*, vol. iv. p. 47.

[b] The manner in which modern Unitarians abuse the credulity of their readers, cannot be better exemplified than by the remarks which I am about to offer upon their treatment of this text. These remarks, also, at the same time that they will be found to evince the shameful disingenuousness with which the critics of this school conduct their inquiries, cannot but manifest their extreme anxiety to avail themselves of every means, whereby they may perplex the meaning, and evade the force, of this important part of Scripture.

The Editors, in the first place, say, "The word 'God' appears to have

as if distrusting their sufficiency, they have taken care to seek additional strength from the dexterity of a new trans-

been wanting in *Chrysostom's* and some other ancient copies: see *Grotius* and *Griesbach.*"—*Mr. Belsham*, again, one of the principal of these Editors, following up the same observation with somewhat more of expansion, says, "*Erasmus, Grotius, Dr. Clarke*, and others observe, that though the word *God* is found in all our present copies, it was wanting in those of *Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom*, and others, and is therefore of *doubtful authority.*" (*Calm Inq.* p. 222.) Now, a little attention to the particulars of the above assertions will, I trust, abundantly prove, that they are, in all their parts, substantially *untrue*. To begin with *Mr. Belsham's* assertion, that *Erasmus, Grotius*, and *Dr. Clarke*, affirm, that the word, *God*, was wanting in the copies of *Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom*, and others: so, as far as *Dr. Clarke* is concerned, it is to be observed, that, however he may have countenanced the idea that there were copies in which the word was not found, he has never once mentioned the name of *Cyprian*, or of *Hilary*, or of *Chrysostom*, in any of his observations upon this text, nor has he specified the name of any ancient whatever in whose copy the word was wanting. See *Clarke's Works*, vol. iv. pp. 46, 47. 274. 280. 369. 418. 569. If *Mr. Belsham* can discover, in these, or any other parts, of *Dr. Clarke's* writings, a contradiction to this assertion, he will produce it.—In the next place, as to *Grotius*;—neither does *he* assert that the copies of *Cyprian, Hilary*, and *Chrysostom*, wanted the word, *God*. He merely refers to *Erasmus*, as having said this, but in terms much less explicit than those in which *Mr. Belsham* has made the statement for him. *Theolog. Works*, vol. iii. p. 726. He has, indeed, asserted, for himself, that the word is wanting in the *Syriac Version*, which is possibly alluded to by *Mr. Belsham* under the word "*others.*" But in this *Grotius* was strangely mistaken, the word being expressly contained in that Version. The whole, then, of the assertion sustained by the threefold authority of *Erasmus, Grotius*, and *Dr. Clarke*, we find, subsides into the single authority of *Erasmus*. But what shall we say, if even *Erasmus* himself does not make the assertion which *Mr. Belsham* has ascribed to him?

First, as to *Chrysostom*, *Erasmus* does, indeed, in one place, say, that this Father, in his *Commentary* on the passage, supplies no *distinct intimation* that he read the word *God* in his copy: but he at the same time admits, that, in *Chrysostom's* quotation of the text itself, he gives it precisely as it stands in our present received reading of the Greek. Nay, more; he allows, that, even from the *Commentary*, it may be collected, that *Chrysostom* must have read Θεὸς in the original: for, after quoting from it at length, he proceeds to express his opinion, that the mention of "THE FATHER" introduced into the exposition, can only be explained on the supposition of its being conveyed, in the context of the Apostle, under the word "GOD." And, again, he remarks, that the clause "*Benedictus in sæcula*" is referred by *Chrysostom* to THE SON; which, he observes, could not be done, unless on the supposition, that the clause, "*qui est super omnia Deus*," was also referred to the same. As it is of great consequence that these remarks of *Erasmus* should be fully understood, I here transcribe his very words. Speaking of *Chrysostom's* comment upon the place, he says, "Quoniam autem subobscure videtur hunc interpretari locum, commentum quod ad hunc attinet locum, bona fide adscribam, *Nam et adoptio* inquit, *fuit gratiæ Dei et gloria, et promissiones, et Lex. Quæ omnia considerans animo, ac reputans quantum Deus cum Filio suo studium adhibuerit ad servandos Judæos, vehementer ex-*

lation. The words τὸ κατὰ σάρκα would, in their usual rendering, have been too significant in a passage so strongly

clamavit, dicens, Qui est benedictus in sæcula, Amen: pro omnibus his gratiam referens ad unigenitum Dei. Quid enim, inquit, si cæteri maledicunt! Nos tamen qui novimus illius arcana, et ineffabilem sapientiam, multamque providentiam, certo scimus illum esse dignum, qui glorificetur, non qui convitiis incessatur, &c. Primum, hunc locum *conjunctim* interpretatur de PATRE ET FILIO, cum in contextu nulla sit mentio PATRIS, *nisi nomine* DEI *intelligatur*. Deinde cum ait 'gratiarum actionem pro omnibus' quæ commemoravit 'reddi unigenito Dei,' significat hæc verba *benedictus insæcula* referenda ad FILIUM, cui Judæi maledicebant, quod aliis promisisset, aliis exhiberet promissum. Atqui hæc particula NON POTEST AD CHRISTUM PERTINERE, NISI AD EUNDEM ET ILLA REFERANTUR, *qui est super omnia Deus.*"—*Critici Sacri*, tom. vii. pp. 2677, 2678.—Now, after reading these remarks of *Erasmus*, although he afterwards says of *Chrysostom*, "nullam dat *significationem* se hoc loco legisse DEUS," (by which, consistently with what he had before enforced, he must mean, that the Greek Father had given in his Commentary no *distinct declaration* that he read the word, *God*, in his copy,) how is it possible, in fairness, to pronounce, that *Erasmus* has affirmed that the word was wanting in *Chrysostom's* copy of this Epistle? And, more especially, when *Erasmus* expressly states that the *text* itself is quoted in the copies of *Chrysostom*, in the very words of the received text. For, in speaking of the pointing of the verse, as quoted by this Father, at the same time remarking that the exact distribution of the parts of a sentence is often disturbed by the transcribers, he thus expresses himself, "Eam apud *Chrysostomum* ita distinctam reperi, ὧν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα· hic interposito colo sequitur ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός· hinc addita hypostigme sequitur, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· quæ distinctio reddit hanc sententiam, *Ille qui est super omnia, nempe Deus, sit benedictus in secula.*"—So much for the good faith preserved in speaking of *Erasmus's report of Chrysostom!*

Next, as to *Cyprian* and *Hilary; Erasmus* undoubtedly affirms, that the former, (*Adv. Judæos*, lib. 2, cap. 5,) and the latter, (on Psalm 122,) cite this passage, omitting the word, *God*, in the quotation. But, at the same time, he adds, that this omission seems to have taken place through the carelessness of the transcribers: "incuriâ librariorum esse omissum videri:"—which, indeed, he might well have added, since, as *Beza* remarks, the citation is made in both places for the very purpose of proving that the *name* of GOD strictly and properly belongs to Christ:—"quum utrobique citetur ob hoc ipsum hic locus, ut probetur DEI nomen Christo vere et proprie competere." (*Beza* in locum.)

We now see to what the whole of *Erasmus's* authority amounts. So far from having *asserted*, that the word *God* was *wanting* in the copies of *Cyprian, Hilary*, and *Chrysostom;* he admits the actual existence of the word in *Chrysostom*, and its highly probable existence in the writings of the other two Fathers, notwithstanding that in certain parts of their works, and in certain copies of them, there might be an appearance of the omission. Thus, then, the whole fabric of testimonies concerning these Fathers, which *Mr. Belsham* has so exultingly erected in the defence of himself and his brother-editors, almost entirely vanishes upon the touch. *Erasmus, Grotius*, and *Dr. Clarke. Clarke* has never named these Fathers upon this text. *Grotius*, in speaking of them, has only referred to the authority of *Erasmus*. And *Erasmus* does not make the assertion that *Mr. Belsham*

marked as the one before us. It was particularly necessary to veil from the view every expression that would direct the

has ascribed to him in conjunction with *Grotius* and *Clarke*

But, even granting that all these writers had, separately and independently, made the assertion which has been attributed to them, relative to the copies of these ancient Fathers, yet would it not have been worthy of those who profess to have TRUTH only for their object, and whose entire endeavours are (as we are told) devoted to the acquiring a CORRECTED TEXT and an IMPROVED VERSION of the New Testament, to have examined these Fathers for themselves; and not to have taken, upon second-hand evidence, a report, which was to shake the authority of the text of Scripture? Without going even to the works of the Fathers,—and yet to such profound scholars and deep inquirers, as *they* might naturally be supposed, who have undertaken to prove *all* preceding critics and theologians totally mistaken in the true reading and sense of the New Testament, there could have been no great difficulty in doing so,—they might have found in *Pearson*, or in *Whitby*, abundant proof, that the word, *God*, was *not* wanting in the copies of the Fathers above alluded to: or they might have derived full satisfaction, as to the indisputable genuineness of the word, from the negative evidence afforded by *Wetstein;* whose learning, industry, and good will, have never been deficient in discovering any circumstance that might cast a doubt on the genuineness of those parts of Scripture that support the proper divinity of Christ, and who, on the present text, has not assigned a single authority, or even conjecture, to disturb its possession of the word Θεός. But, as these gentlemen have not thought proper to go back to the authorities themselves, to which they have chosen to refer through the medium of *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, and *Clarke*, (with what success we have seen,) I have found it necessary to do this for them; and, having done so, I must take the liberty of saying, that the *three Fathers*, whom they have chosen to approach by so circuitous a course, openly announce in the most decisive manner that they *did* read the word, *God*, in their copies of this Epistle.

1. *St. Cyprian* produces this text for the special purpose of proving, *quod Deus Christus;* and reckons it amongst those in which Christ is expressly *called* GOD. (*Cypr. Opera*, Oxon. lib. ii. cap. 5. *Adv. Jud.* p. 35.) The text is here given precisely according to the present received reading: and, whilst the Editor admits that there were one or two editions in which the word, *Deus*, was wanting, yet he pronounces (with good reason) the reading to be unquestionable. *Pearson* specifies the MSS. in which it was *known* to exist; and states other circumstances that place it beyond a doubt.—(*Expos. of the Creed*, pp. 132, 133.) 2. *St. Hilary*, on the 122d Psalm, quotes this passage, *Ex quibus Christus qui est super omnia Deus*, in conjunction with other passages of Scripture, to prove, "quod Deus nobis unus non solus." (*Hilar. Opera*, p. 393.) And, again, in his book *De Trinitate* he introduces it in a most emphatical manner: "Non ignorat Paulus Christum DEUM, dicens, *Quorum sunt patres, et ex quibus Christus, qui est super omnia Deus:*" adding also what rests the whole force of his argument on the existence of the *word*, "DEUS,"—"Non hic creatura in DEUM deputatur, sed creaturarum DEUS est, qui *super omnia* DEUS est."—(*Opera*, p. 970.) 3. As to *St. Chrysostom*, we have already seen, that, in his quotation of the text of the Apostle, he precisely agrees with the reading of the present Greek: so that any pretence derived from his not distinctly pointing out the very word Θεός in his Com-

mind to a contrast so emphatically exhibiting the twofold nature of our Lord; and, therefore, the designation of our

mentary upon the text is trifling. On the same ground it must be said that *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων* did not exist in his copy; because whatever reason there is for saying that he passes over the word *Θεὸς* applies to the whole clause. On the same ground the words *κατὰ σάρκα* after *συγγενῶν* in the 3d verse, and *ὅτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται*, in the beginning of the 4th verse, must be pronounced not to have been in his copy, because he does not distinctly notice them in his Commentary, ("nullam dat significationem se hoc loco legisse" hæc verba,) at the same time that, as in the case of the word *Θεὸς*, he places them in his quotations of the text. The truth is, that the course of this Father's reasoning in his Commentary did not lead him to advert in this place to our Lord's *divinity*, as may be easily seen by attending to the nature of his exposition. The part, which immediately precedes what has been already quoted at p. 164, is as follows, in the Latin translation. "Nam cum dicit, *Quorum adoptio et gloria et legis constitutio et cultus et promissiones:* aliud erit nihil, quam Deum voluisse illos quidem servare, atque hoc patere facit per ea quæ Christus ex illis extitit, per ea quæ patribus promisit. Illi autem a propria ingratitudine atque improbitate beneficentiam repulerunt. Itaque et illa ponit, non quæ illorum laudes sunt, sed quæ Dei donum solummodo arguunt." Then follows as before given at p. 164. (See *Chrys. Comment.* vol. ii. p. 229.) If the whole context be considered, it will appear manifestly, that the object of the Father, in this part of his exposition, is to mark the great and undeserved goodness of God to the Jews, in accomplishing for them and through them so many good things; and that therefore there was no room for any special observation on the subject of our Lord's divinity. But at the same time, as we have already seen, even in *Erasmus's* view of the case, the *bearing* of the word GOD, and as applied to *Christ*, is decidedly marked in the course of the Father's observations: so much so that there can be no doubt, *even from the Commentary*, that he must have read *Θεὸς* in his copy; independently of the consideration of its actual occurrence in his quotation of the text, and in two other parts of his works which shall be presently pointed out.

I have dwelt the longer upon *Chrysostom*, for the purpose of making a remark on *Griesbach's* note upon the Father's reading of the passage.— "Chrys. ad h. l. post *κατὰ σάρκα* præterit verba *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς*, et *statim* progreditur ad: *ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, addens: *τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχαριστίαν ἀναφέρων αὐτὸς* (s. *αὐτῷ*) *τῷ μονογενεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Sed *in textu et alibi leguntur ista.*" Now, although *Griesbach* here falls very short of stating the case with its due force, (for so far from an *immediate transition* from the words *κατὰ σάρκα* to *ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς*, &c., much matter is introduced tending to indicate the existence of the word *Θεὸς* in the original passage of which *Chrysostom* was treating, as may be seen at pp. 571 and 575,) yet he sufficiently marks by the use of the word "*præterit*," that he meant to represent *Chrysostom*, as *passing over, in this place, the consideration of* the words *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς*, not that they were *omitted in his copy;* for he immediately subjoins, "*in textu et alibi leguntur;*" announcing, that this Father, although he had not specially noticed the words in his *Comment*, had yet, in his reciting of the *text* of the Apostle, and in *other places*, given them exactly as they stand in our received text. It has been already seen, that, in *quoting* the *text* of the Apostle, *Chrysostom* agrees exactly with the present reading. We shall now see, how far Griesbach was justified in asserting the same of *other*

Lord's Jewish extraction by terms which pointed out a *fleshly origin* in *opposition* to an origin of a *higher* nature, was to

places of this Father's writings, "*alibi.*" In the fifth Homily, *De incomprehensib. Dei natura contra* Ἀνομοίους (*Opera*, vol. i. p. 382,) we find the whole passage, exactly as it is now given in the text of *Griesbach*, applied to prove the divinity of Christ. And again in the third Homily *in cap.* 1. *Evang. Joh.* (*Comm.* vol. ii. p. 36,) we have the words, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς combined with the texts, Tit. ii. 13; Philip. ii. 6; and Rom. i. 7, to constitute a proof, that the word Θεὸς is frequently applied to Christ *without the article*: and that, consequently, no difference in deity, is intended to be marked in Scripture, between the Father and the Son. Thus, then, *Chrysostom* becomes a decisive witness for the existence of the word *God*, in the copies of this Epistle which he used: and so, in truth, *Griesbach* represents him. Yet the Editors of the Unitarian N. T. would *reject* this word on the authority of *Chrysostom*, and on *Griesbach's* representation of that authority!—"The word 'God' appears to have been wanting in *Chrysostom's* and some other ancient copies. See *Grotius* and *Griesbach.*" Of *Grotius* we have already spoken. The reader may now judge of *Griesbach.*—Such is the abuse of authorities exercised by Unitarian writers, without shame or scruple: and this, too, not merely in the ardour of controversial contest, but with the cool and deliberate purpose of falsifying the word of God. Such are the means by which scanty learning, and dishonest criticism, jointly endeavour, under the pretence of obtaining a *corrected text* and an *improved version*, to corrupt the original, and to pervert the translation, of all those parts of the N. T. in which the characteristic doctrines of Christianity are involved.

Now, what will the reader say, when he is informed, that the word, *God*, in this text, the authority of which it has been thus attempted to shake under the sound of the names of *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, *Dr. Clarke*, *Griesbach*, ("AND OTHERS,") *St. Cyprian*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Chrysostom*, ("AND OTHERS,") is found in *every known Manuscript* of this Epistle, in *every ancient Version extant*, and (in direct opposition to all that has been asserted by *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors, and notwithstanding the trifling additional remark in Griesbach of "*Leo* SEMEL et *Ephr. ap. Jackson,*") in EVERY FATHER who has had occasion to cite the passage? So that, in truth, there can scarcely be instanced a text in the N. T. in which *all* the ancient authorities more satisfactorily agree. So circumstanced is that reading of the text, which Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors require us to consider as "of doubtful authority."—For the numerous instances of the citation of this verse by the Fathers, I refer the reader to *Whitby* in loc. and to *Bull*, *Oper.* pp. 72, 73, and especially to pp. 249, 250, for the exposure of *Erasmus's* error concerning *Origen.*

But, to follow these Unitarian critics to another point. Having thus, as we have seen, flung doubts upon the existence of the word *God* in the original, but feeling, at the same time, (with good reason,) some misgivings as to their reception, the next step taken by them, is an endeavour to prevent the application of the word to Christ; whereby the end proposed would be equally attained as by its rejection from the text. Accordingly, the propriety of a new punctuation is suggested, by which the verse may be separated into two distinct sentences: thus, "Of whom by natural descent Christ came. God who is over all be blessed for ever." In support of this interpretation, the principal vindicator of the Version deals out, as usual, a string of names: and amongst these he introduces the name

give place to one of less forcible application; and the phrase "*by natural descent*" was substituted for the received rendering of the words.

of *Locke;* a name, which, (as we have already noticed,) the Unitarians are particularly ambitious to press into the service, in order to give countenance to a pretence, which is directly contradictory to the known truth, (see pp. 132, 133, of this volume) that *Locke* was a *Socinian*. Now, as we saw *Cyprian*, *Hilary*, and *Chrysostom* misrepresented in the last clause, so we shall find *Locke* most flagrantly belied in this. For so far is *Locke* from placing a full stop after the word σάρκα, and reading, (as it is here asserted,) "God who is over all be blessed for ever," that he separates, by a point introduced after πάντων, the clause, "he who is over all," from the words that follow, and reads in a distinct member, "God be blessed for ever." *Mr. Belsham's* aversion to the trouble of consulting the original authorities supplies no apology for his misrepresentation of *Locke* in this place; because, even without referring to *Locke* himself, he might have met with his division of the verse in most of the recent publications that treat of this text; and particularly in the writings of those whom his Unitarian predilections most dispóse him to consult. He might have met with it in *Wetstein's* note, "Vel ut *J. Lockius: Qui Christus est super omnia: Deus sit benedictus!*" He might have met with it in the Unitarian's *Remarks on the Scriptural Confutation of Mr. Burgh*. Or he might have met with it in his friend *Dr. Carpenter's* book. Indeed it is a point so notorious, that it is scarcely possible to give Mr. Belsham credit for ignorance upon the subject.

Now, the reader will easily perceive the great difference that exists between the reading adopted by *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors, and that proposed by *Mr. Locke*, which, though it agrees with the former, in concluding the sentence with a doxology in praise of the Father, yet admits the exalted dignity and extended dominion of our Lord expressed by the words, "*who is over all;*" and which, in the opinion of Erasmus, treating of this very distribution of the sentence, attributes *divinity* to Christ as forcibly as the word, *God*, could. "*Ex quibus Christus juxta carnem, qui Christus est super omnia:* sive, *qui erat super omnia.* Ne quis enim suspicaretur, dignitatem imminutam per assumptam hominis naturam, respiciens ad Divinitatem adjecit, *qui est super omnia.* Hæc distinctio tribuit Divinitatem Christo, quod nihil est *super omnia*, præter UNUM DEUM." (Crit. Sac. pp. 2676, 2677.) It will not now be difficult to appreciate the dependence which is to be placed on the assertions of a writer, who claims *Locke* as a supporter of the former reading, and thereby associates him as an auxiliary in the Unitarian interpretation of the sentence throughout. In truth, *Mr. Locke* not only differs from the Unitarian Editors, in his distribution of the sentence, which is (as far as they are concerned) a vital variation; but he completely overturns their whole system, by the sense which he gives to the sentence at large; rendering τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, "*as to his* FLESHLY EXTRACTION;" which "FLESHLY EXTRACTION" he contrasts (as we have already seen at p. 133, in his observations on Rom. i. 3) with the "DIVINE EXTRACTION *immediately from God;*" and which (as we have also seen) he more fully explains by paraphrasing the words *as to the flesh* thus:—"i. e. as to the *body which he took* in the womb of the blessed virgin his mother." Such is the support which *Mr. Locke* contributes to these writers, who are perpetually sounding his name as one of

But the point, with which we are more immediately concerned, is, not so much the change of version, (totally unthe most decided advocates of their system; and such is the mode in which these writers fabricate to support their cause!

Mr. Locke's interpretation, however, and every other which converts the concluding clause into a doxology to the Father, is, as has been unanswerably shown, especially by *Dr. Middleton*, altogether inadmissible. *Dr. Carpenter*, upon the whole of this subject, has acted with more fairness than *Mr. Belsham*. He has not only not confounded *Mr. Locke's* interpretation of the passage with that of the Unitarian Version; but he has admitted *Dr. Middleton's* arguments into consideration, and has even acknowledged them to "have *some weight*" so far as they apply to *Mr. Locke's* view of the passage, at the same time that he denies that they possess any force as opposed to the interpretation of it by the Unitarians. But let *Dr. Carpenter* labour to varnish the matter as he may, the objections urged by *Dr. Middleton*, and since enforced by *Mr. Veysie* and *Dr. Nares*, against *both* the modes of interpretation, that of the Unitarians and that of *Mr. Locke*, against all, in short, that would break the concluding part of the verse into a separate sentence in the form of a doxology, are, and must be allowed by every Greek scholar to be, incontrovertible. *Dr. Whitby* had before abundantly shown, that such a distribution and punctuation of the sentence as these interpretations demanded could not be defended on any just principles of criticism. That the reasoning of *Whitby* or *Middleton* should be noticed by *Mr. Belsham*, was not, indeed, to be expected. It would have been a departure from the established usage of that writer, and most of his associates, to bestow consideration upon the arguments of any who oppose the tenets and dogmas of their party. But surely the observations of *Mr. Wakefield* might have been taken into account. *Mr. Wakefield*, who is so favourite an authority with Unitarians on almost all occasions; whose Version of the N. T. the Editors of the present one had for some time anxiously in contemplation for the basis of their own;—his judgment upon this subject cannot surely be suspected of any orthodox bias. And, if even this writer, (the only Greek scholar, whatever may have been the degree of his pretensions, that the English Unitarians have to boast of,) if even he, with all his earnest desire to embrace whatever might favour the Unitarian cause, was not able to digest the harsh and unnatural construction adopted by the Editors in this place, what judgment ought (I will not say a critic and a scholar, because such a man would and ought to judge for himself, but) even *Mr. Belsham's* favourite arbiter in Scripture criticism, the man of merely "sound understanding and honest mind," what judgment ought he to form upon the subject? *Mr. Wakefield's* observations I shall give in his own words. "Some critics have proposed to distinguish the verse in the following manner: *Of whom were the Fathers, of whom was the Christ according to the flesh. God, who is over all, be blessed for evermore! Amen. Or thus: Of whom were the Fathers, of whom was the Christ according to the flesh, who is over all. God be blessed for evermore! Amen.* — Both these constructions, though the original will certainly admit them, appear so awkward, so abrupt, so incoherent, that, it must be confessed, I never yet could bring myself to relish them in the least degree. There seems to be no reason, from the spirit of the context, for such an instantaneous and solemn conversion from the main subject to the Deity; nor do I believe, that a parallel instance of so disjointed an address can be produced from the whole Bible." See

justifiable as that is,) as, that the change should have been made *without notice:* a change, to which the Editors attach

Wakefield's Inquiry into the Opinions, &c. vol. i. pp. 162, 163.) — *Rosenmüller* also the Unitarians are disposed to regard as a respectable and unbiassed Commentator. What does he say on this point?—" Interpretatio ea, qua hæc verba ad PATREM referuntur, *nec contextui nec regulis Grammaticis est conveniens.* Quod si enim vera esset, Paulus non ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς, sed potius ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων scripturus fuisset, ut 2 Cor. xi. 31. Istud vero ὁ ὤν, quod h. l. legimus, positum est pro ὅς ἐστι, ut Jo. i. 18, et iii. 13, ideoque *ad Christum pertinet*, de quo antea dixerat, eum κατὰ σάρκα e Judæis, ortum esse; jam vero, ne hic subsistant Christiani ex Judæis, *divinam Messiæ majestatem* addita doxologia celebrat." (*Schol. in Nov. Test.* tom. iii. p. 482.) —But what says the Father of Socinianism himself? Whilst labouring with all his might to prevent this passage from establishing the proper deity of Christ, he is not only obliged to confess, that the ancient authorities are in favour of the commonly received distribution and construction of the sentence; but he is also forced to admit, that the *position* of εὐλογητὸς is inconsistent with that punctuation which the Unitarian rendering requires. (*Socin. Opera, Respons. ad Vujek*, tom. ii. pp. 582. 600.) This, which is one of the chief arguments employed by *Whitby* and *Middleton*, seems also not to have been pressed upon *Socinus* by his opponents, but rather to have originated with himself, as naturally growing out of the genius of the Greek and the phraseology of the N. T.: and so overbearing did he feel the force of its application, that he was compelled by it to concede, that the concluding words of the verse related to Christ; although, to prevent the conclusion which hence resulted in favour of our Lord's divinity, he was driven to the extravagant assertion, that as Christ was not simply called *God*, but *God over all*, this could not interfere with his proper humanity, but, on the contrary, admitted with regard to him the most appropriate application:—an assertion so extravagant, that *Mr. Belsham* exclaims against it with the greatest vehemence, in his note, p. 224, where he ascribes it to *Slichtingius* only. He was not perhaps aware, that this is a position maintained by *all* the old Socinian writers, who have treated of this verse. But it should be recollected, that it has been maintained by them, *because* they could not embrace that other extravagance which the modern Socinians so strongly recommend. *They* studied and knew the original somewhat better than those who have followed them: and between the violation of the principles of the language required by the modern interpretation of the text, and the extravagance of the gloss upon the true translation demanded by their own, they felt there was no difficulty of choice. They were, in short, incapable of such *criticism* as is familiar with modern Unitarians; and therefore they found it impossible to deny, (however they might endeavour to explain it,) that Christ is here pronounced to be *God over all*, and *blessed for evermore*. *Crellius* and *Slichtingius* are fully as decided upon this point as *Socinus:* and the latter specially adds, that from this passage of St. Paul we learn, that praises, and benedictions, and divine worship, are to be offered to Christ. See *Crell. Opera*, tom. i. (*Resp. ad Grot.*) p. 230. (*Ethic. Christ.*) p. 348. tom. ii. p. 224. in locum, also *Slichting. Comment. Posth.* tom. i. p. 254.

I have noticed two attempts of the *Calm Inquirer*, and his brother Editors, to disturb the obvious and commonly received reading and interpretation of the passage in question. We come now to a third view of the case which they

so high a value; and which, with the Archbishop's Version lying before them, which they professed to follow, could not seem to consider preferable to every other; and which, strange to say, requires the dereliction of the very points which it had before been deemed necessary to maintain; demanding for its admissibility the retaining of Θεὸς in the text; and rejecting all idea of the doxology, which had been so eagerly contended for, and of the peculiar punctuation on which that doxology was founded. This most happy and plausible conjecture, which is taken from the old Socinian writer *Slichtingius*, consists, *Mr. Belsham* informs us, in "the transposition of a single letter, ὢν ὁ, for ὁ ὤν, which gives a new and beautiful turn to the whole sentence, viz. 'Of whom is the adoption,—of whom are the fathers,—of whom is the Messiah,—OF WHOM is God over all blessed for ever.' Thus the climax rises gradually and finishes where it ought." (*Calm Inq.* p. 223.) Now, in the first place, it is to be observed, that *Mr. Belsham* has here produced, as from *Slichtingius*, a piece of criticism, which, in the exact form in which he has presented it, neither *Slichtingius*, nor any critic acquainted with the Greek language, has, or could have given. *Mr. Belsham* has put ὢν ὁ instead of ὁ ὤν, and thinks, that, in doing so, he has substituted the genitive plural of the relative for the participle present of the verb substantive; whereas, in truth, no participle appears in his reading of the passage at all. The old Socinian understood the language too well to have been guilty of such a blunder. His was not a mere change of the position of letters, but a transposition of the words, modified of course with their due accompaniments; a change of ὁ ὤν into ὢν ὁ; giving, as was intended, a real change of the participle into the genitive plural of the relative. It cannot be here pretended, that the error is a mere mistake of the printer in the *breathings* attached to the words; for *Mr. Belsham* himself takes care to inform us, that the *only change* to be made, is the "transposition of a SINGLE LETTER," expressly excluding the idea of any other alteration whatsoever, and agreeably to this exhibiting none other in his page. Other writers, indeed, may have spoken generally of transposing the two *words;* that of course implying the entire modification of the words, and consequently including all their attendant characters: but, I will venture to say, that *Mr. Belsham* has the sole credit of discovering that "the transposition of a *single letter*" is the *only change* requisite to give that "new and beautiful turn to the whole sentence," of which he speaks. If it be said, that, although we, at this day, employ accents and breathings in our notation of the Greek, yet, the ancient Greek MSS. being written without them, the transposition of a single letter would, in *them*, produce the change which *Mr. Belsham* describes;—let it be remembered, that this makes no difference in the case, so far as *Mr. Belsham* is concerned; inasmuch as it is not upon *them* he builds his remark: it is to the Greek character in its *present* state, he applies his observation; pronouncing upon *that* the sufficiency of the transposition of a single letter for the change which it requires; and exemplifying his assertion by an adjustment of the aspirate marks, such as to cause no change *but* "the transposition of a single letter;" and, consequently, proving to the world how very imperfectly he is acquainted with even the lowest rudiments of the language on which he ventures to comment.—But, to pass from these modern blunders to the ancient MSS. it should be recollected, that, as *no one* Manuscript, nor *any single* Version nor Father, gives the sentence at this day with the reading that has been here suggested; the transposition, if it took place at all,

have been made without the fullest deliberation and design. This must be evident to every one who considers not merely

must have been of a very early date, of a date almost as early as that of the Epistle itself. Now will any person conversant with the history of the Greek language, undertake to affirm that, at so remote a period, the change, which has been here spoken of, could have been effected by "the transposition of a single letter?" Can any one acquainted with the ancient Greek inscriptions venture to assert that the Greek aspirate H had ceased to be employed in the age in which St. Paul's Epistle was written? And if, on the contrary, there be good reason to think that it had not, will he deem that change so likely, which, so far from consisting in the mere transposition of a letter, would demand the alteration of the word

ΗΩΝΗΟ into ΗΟΩΝ?

But, not only have we to urge against the proposed reading the admitted fact that no vestige of such a reading has been discovered in *any one* of all the MSS., Versions, and quotations, that have come down to our times; but we have also to urge against it, as has been clearly and ably shown by *Dr. Middleton*, that it would both give a false Greek and a direct contradiction to St. Paul's own reasoning. (See *Middleton on the Greek Article*, p. 456.) But for the Critics with whom I am concerned, reasonings of this description are not requisite. Their own showing generally suffices to overturn their argument. The single reason, advanced by *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors, in favour of the proposed conjectural reading, is, that the climax is by this regularly carried on and fully completed. "Ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία, Ὧν οἱ πατέρες, Ὧν Χριστὸς, Ὧν ὁ Θεὸς, *of whom was the adoption, of whom were the fathers, of whom was Christ, of whom was God who is over all.*" (*Imp. Vers.* in loc. and *Calm Inq.* p. 223.) Now it happens, unfortunately for the smoothness and continuity of the climax, that the form of expression is not carried on as it is here given; the words not being ὧν Χριστὸς but Ἐξ ὧν Χριστὸς, which at once breaks the continuity, as marking the *extraction* of Christ, and therefore requiring in the English the force of the *derivative;* not, as in the other clauses, that of the *possessive*. *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors have availed themselves of the ambiguity of the phrase "OF WHOM," to give an *appearance* of sameness to the several clauses; whilst in reality they differ; and thus they make out their climax by giving first a false text, and then an equivocating translation. So much for this "new and beautiful turn," bestowed upon the sentence before us, by a conjecture which has not a single Manuscript, or Version, or authority of any kind, to sustain it; which makes St. Paul contradict himself; which utters false Greek; and which does not accomplish the only point that is brought forward to recommend it,—the continuing and completing of a climax.

That Socinians, whose minds are antecedently satisfied as to what Scripture ought to mean, should eagerly catch at this, or any other, conjecture, that promises the semblance of support to their system, is not to be wondered at: but it certainly is just matter of surprise and concern, that *Griesbach* should have condescended to mix with the grave authorities that are to substantiate the true text of Scripture, a conjecture so trifling, so contemptible, so objectionable, and so unauthorized. It has been already observed that this Critic, although not intending himself to shake the authenticity of the word Θεὸς in this text, had yet, by an injudicious and perplexed mode of displaying authorities which do not in reality make against the word, afforded to those who only sought some pretext for its rejection, a colour for using the authority of his name.

the wideness of the departure from the Archbishop's translation, "*as concerning the flesh;*" but also the constraining

But I have farther to add concerning the same distinguished Critic, in this place, in point of accuracy, that he has been guilty of an inadvertency, here, in omitting to observe, that the *Cod. Alex.* wants all that follows in the fourth verse, after the word Ἰσραηλῖται, or, as this MS. reads the word, Ἰσραηλίται.

Enough has been offered in this note to show, that the Unitarian Editors have strained every nerve for the withdrawing of this important text from the list of those that go to support the *divinity*, and to establish the *two distinct natures* of Christ. Enough also has been offered to make it evident that all the objections and difficulties which they have laboured to throw in the way of its just application only tend to prove the degree to which they are deficient in the candour, and the learning, requisite for a sound exposition of Scripture. And enough, surely, has been offered to satisfy the reader, that upon the accuracy of their quotations, and their reports of ancient authorities, no reliance whatever is to be placed. Indeed, to make the true nature and value of the criticisms of these writers fully understood, it might have been sufficient to observe, that the construction and sense of the passage which they have adopted depends entirely upon the genuineness of the very word Θεὸς, which they have taken so much pains to prove to be "of dubious authority;" and that the conjectural interpretation, which they seem (at least *Mr. Belsham* does) to admire above every other, requires, not only that the word *God* should be received as indisputably genuine, but that the punctuation which they reject should be retained as the true one. Thus, truth, in the hands of these critics, is made to war with itself. The same word is both spurious and genuine, the same punctuation correct and erroneous, according as each supposition ministers to a Socinian interpretation of the Scriptures; according as each is found conformable to that paramount Unitarian test, by which the modern Socinians determine without hesitation upon every question affecting the sense of the Sacred Text.

As to the direct arguments in favour of the commonly received construction and application of the passage in question; these have been so satisfactorily stated by *Whitby*, and various other distinguished Commentators, and have recently been so fully and ably vindicated by *Dr. Middleton* and *Dr. Nares* against all the modern attempts to subvert them, that it is altogether unnecessary (did it even fall within my plan) to present them to the reader.—In addition to the well known treatises of *Dr. Middleton*, and *Dr. Nares*, I would recommend to the reader's attention, on the subject of this note, *Mr. Veysie's Defence of the Preservative* (pp. 107—112), *Burgh's Inquiry* (pp. 23—32), *Simpson's Plea* (pp. 241—243. 255), and *Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy* (pp. 69—72. 419, 420). This last writer, who has treated many important points of this controversy with great ability, has made an observation particularly deserving of notice on the conjectural alteration of ὁ ὤν, into ὢν ὁ already treated of at p. 172, &c. — The conjunction καὶ, he says, in the enumeration of the series of particulars, must connect itself with the last; and therefore were there no other argument against the proposed alteration than this, that καὶ must become thereby connected, not with the last, but with an intermediate, article of the series, he thinks, and justly, it would be decisive. The alteration, therefore, if it were admitted, must be not merely of ὁ ὤν into ὢν ὁ, but into καὶ ὢν ὁ, the καὶ being transferred from the preceding clause, καὶ ἐξ ὢν ὁ Χριστὸς. Indeed the Editors themselves were so sensible that the copulative could not stand where it

force which the Archbishop exerts upon the reader's attention, by the still more emphatical language of the note upon these words—"of whom *as to his* HUMAN *lineage* Christ is descended," &c. It is also to be observed, that, not only have the Editors made this remarkable change, without the slightest notice of the Archbishop's rendering either in the text or note of his Version, but that they have done so, although they have themselves introduced a long note upon the passage, and in this note remark upon their variation from the Archbishop in the *remaining* part of the text:—"the Common Version here adopted by *Dr. Newcome* is, *Who is over all, God blessed for ever.*" And here they stop as to the matter of variation, giving the reader to understand that they have laid before him the *whole* of their departure

does, on admitting the proposed transposition, that they have taken care to strike it out of the passage altogether; as may be seen in their mode of adjusting the clauses of the sentence, as it has been stated at page 173. Thus, to the violence of the transposition, and the exclusion of the preposition ἐξ, we have now to add their exclusion of the conjunction καὶ: so that before we can allow to the Editors the benefit of the "new and beautiful turn" that they conceive to be given to the sentence by the transposition of the words, they must not only transpose the words, but they must strike the two words καὶ and ἐξ entirely out of the text.

In this note, we have seen several distinguished names referred to by the Unitarians: some of whom, especially *Grotius* and *Locke*, they are willing on many occasions to claim as auxiliaries to their cause. How unfounded this claim is with respect to *Locke*, has been already noticed; and occasion may be taken again to advert to it. As for *Grotius*, although his exposition of many passages of Scripture is (as I have already remarked elsewhere) so favourable to the general principles of Socinianism, that some have thought the title of Socinian not altogether inapplicable to him; yet, the various instances of his direct assertion of the divinity of Christ throughout his Commentary, together with his celebrated defence of the doctrine of *Christ's satisfaction* against the attacks of *Socinus*, must surely place him beyond the range of those whom the Unitarians have any reasonable pretence for pressing within their ranks. So many of the instances alluded to have been detailed by *Bishop Burgess* in his Treatise on *The Bible*, &c., (see especially pp. 79. 85—87,) that I shall only add to what is there advanced, a single quotation from the conclusion of the work *De Satisfactione Christi*. Speaking of the Socinian endeavours to degrade the nature of Christ, he uses the following language:—"Sed profecto minime mirum est, si qui Christo gloriam *naturalem*, hoc est *veri nominis deitatem*, sustulerunt, iidem et officia ipsius imminuunt, et beneficia ipsius præcipua recusant agnoscere. TIBI DOMINE JESU, UT VERO DEO, ut vero Redemptori, ut vero Sacerdoti, ut veræ pro peccatis victimæ, CUM PATRE ET SPIRITU, UNO TECUM DEO, SIT HONOS ET GLORIA."

from the *Primate;* whilst they have touched only on that part for which they think they have some show of authority, and on which, accordingly, they dwell at length; but on the part which is purely and exclusively their own, for which they can produce no authority whatever, and which goes to the very essence of the Socinian controversy, they preserve a perfect silence.—On this it must be unnecessary to add any farther observations. Whether the Editors have, on this important part of Scripture, acted with good faith by their professed model, I leave to the reader to judge for himself. I have not noticed here their unacknowledged departure from the *Primate*, (and also from *Griesbach*,) in suppressing the concluding word "*Amen*," as being a matter of inferior consideration, farther than as it tends to give an additional instance of their failure in that *faithful adherence* to the Primate's Version, (and also to *Griesbach's* text,) of which they so much boast.

In the instance of Number V. (see page 17) we find, in a passage directly and forcibly expressing the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord, not only a departure from the *Primate*, in the very terms which convey that important doctrine: but a substitution of others, that completely divest the passage of any such signification. We find, also, a note of some length, enlarging upon and confirming the rendering adopted by the *Imp. Vers.:* and yet, throughout the entire of it, not the most remote hint conveyed of any variance from the *Primate*'s translation: and this too, whilst the *Primate* himself has introduced a note enforcing more strongly the application of the text to the PRE-EXISTENCE. The *Primate* renders, "*though* he was rich, yet for your sakes he *became poor;*" and he subjoins in a Note, "RICH—in the glories of his divine nature"—"POOR—by taking on him human nature, and appearing even in an humble state of life;" quoting, at the same time, as a parallel explanation, the celebrated text of Philipp. ii. 6, &c. The *Imp. Vers.*, on the other hand, renders the passage, "*while* he was rich, yet for your sakes he *lived in poverty:*" and then in the note affirms, that "the

construction requires it to be understood, not of a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty, but of two contemporary states:—he was rich and poor at the same time:" and, from this view of the subject, proceeds to establish the *impossibility* of any reference to the *pre-existence* of Christ. In other words, the *I. V.* translates in a sense directly opposite to that of the *Primate;* labours to enforce the necessity of this sense in a note which is carried to considerable extent, and in which *Wakefield*, *Grotius*, and other authorities, are introduced; does this, in contradiction, not only to the Primate's rendering, but to his illustration and support of that rendering in strong and emphatical terms in *his* note, which directly challenged their attention; all this, too, on a point of *vital import*[a] in the *Unitarian* scheme; and yet in no

[a] *Mr. Belsham*, indeed, in his *Calm Inquiry*, pleasantly enough wishes to persuade us, that if our heads were not already stuffed with the notion of the pre-existence of Christ, we never could "*dream* of finding it in *this* text." He is *so candid* as to admit, that it might furnish perhaps "a graceful allusion;" but he can never allow it to be alleged "as a proof." And why? Because "when it is said of *any man*, that *though he is rich he spends nothing*," no one "in his senses infers from it that he *existed before he was born.* Upon this principle," he adds, "EVERY MISER WOULD HAVE A CLAIM TO PRE-EXISTENCE."—This is the remark of a CALM *Inquirer.* He tells us, that unless we are dreaming, we must admit that the text means nothing more than to inform us of "A MAN WHO, THOUGH HE WAS RICH, SPENT NOTHING," of a mere "MISER:" and then, when we have by this admission, proved ourselves to be wide awake, he will satisfy us, that it has no relation to PRE-EXISTENCE. But, in the mean time, what has become of the "*graceful allusion?*" The elegance and good taste of the CALM INQUIRER'S representation of the "MISER" may, indeed, have conferred upon the subject a *grace:* but the *allusion* to pre-existence, even with our eyes perfectly open, we are no longer able to discover. Yet strange to say, there are persons who have not been looked upon as actual dreamers, although their "judgment" is (of course) held comparatively cheap by the *Calm Inquirer*, who have, notwithstanding, as he himself informs us, "held up this text as a *decisive proof* of this doctrine" of pre-existence. "He was *rich*—'rich,' says Dr. Doddridge, 'in the glories of the heavenly world, and in supreme dominion and authority there, yet for your sakes he became poor.'—'Rich,' says Archbishop Newcome, 'in the glories of the divine nature, he became poor by taking on him human nature, and appearing even in an humble state of life.' —'Rich,' says Dr. Harwood, in 'his pre-existent state, in glory, honour, and happiness, with a greatness of soul which can never be sufficiently extolled, he abdicated all this, and became poor.' The Apostle's argument upon this scheme only is cogent, apposite, and very elegant and persuasive. To interpret this of our Lord being rich in miracles, and becoming poor in them at his crucifixion, is

place is there the slightest glance at this gross departure, nor is the name of the *Archbishop* once alluded to: notwithstanding such a jejune and forced criticism, as I imagine was never used to explain any author." (*Calm Inq.* pp. 122, 123.) All this, however, in the view of the *Calm Inquirer*, is downright nonsense, mere dreaming: since "EVERY MISER would have a claim to *pre-existence*," on the principle that would infer pre-existence from *this* text. It may seem odd that *Dr. Carpenter* should carry himself more *calmly* upon this subject than the CALM *Inquirer*. Yet so it is. For, although the friend and coadjutor of *Mr. Belsham*, and equally anxious with him to withdraw this text from the support of the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence, he yet admits, without casting any imputation of *dreaming*, &c., "that it *may* be translated as in the public version, and that it *may* be interpreted in reference to a *pre-existent state*:" and all he contends for is, that his own translations (which by the by, do not go to the length of that in the *Imp. Vers.*) "equally well suit the original." (*Unit. the Doct.*, p. 231.) *Dr. Carpenter*, it is plain, saw a little more in this text, than the allusion to a person who, "though he was rich, spent nothing;" or in other words, to one who was a mere "MISER." —But, in truth, it must in justice be said of this last mentioned writer, that, although an equally staunch friend to the cause of Unitarianism with *Mr. Belsham*, he does not appear to be exactly of the same class, in the characters of temper, discretion, and decorum.

We need not be surprised that *Mr. Belsham* makes so light of the passage before us, as affecting the argument for our Lord's pre-existence. It is a *rule* with this writer, to treat in like manner the several passages that are adduced in support of that doctrine. Texts of Scripture, which do not merely announce, but proclaim the doctrine, in words so plain, and strong, that language can supply none more unequivocal and forcible, are at once dismissed, (with the appearance of perfect composure and gravity,) either as having no bearing upon the question, or as giving support to the Unitarian scheme of the proper humanity of Christ. Thus, for example, when, in John xvii. 5, our Lord, addressing himself to the Father, prays to be glorified with him *with that glory which he had with the Father before the world was; Mr. Belsham* calmly informs us, that this, when well considered, "contains *no proof* of Christ's *pre-existence*, but is *perfectly compatible with his proper humanity.*" (*Calm Inq.* p. 114.)—Again, when in Coloss. i. 17, St. Paul informs us concerning Christ, that "He is before all things;" *Mr. Belsham* very composedly tells us, that "*no argument* for the pre-existence of Christ can be drawn from *this* ambiguous text." (*Calm Inq.* p. 148.) Again, when in Philipp. ii. 6, &c., we are assured by the Apostle, that Christ, *being in the form of God, had made himself of no reputation, and was made in the likeness of men;* the *Calm Inquirer*, without the slightest discomposure of *his* gravity, (*risum teneatis?* may, however, not be an inexpedient hint to the reader,) assures us, in return, that if *this* text "be not *decisive in favour* of the doctrine" (of "the PROPER HUMANITY of Jesus Christ,") it "may *at least* be regarded as *neutral:*" that, in short, "*it is one of those passages, of which* NO USE *can be made in deciding the controversy.*" (*Calm Inq.* p. 145.)—*Mr. Belsham* had, however, nearly settled the whole question already. For, having disposed of the celebrated passage, (John viii. 58,) πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γένεσθαι ἐγώ εἰμι, by asserting, that the words, *I am*, must mean, *I was;* and by adducing in his support the authority of a number of "able and learned critics and divines," (he might with *equal truth* have added, most impartial and unprejudiced on the

standing the most solemn assurances to the public, first given by the Editors collectively, and since peremptorily repeated

Unitarian question,) *Dr. Lardner*, *Mr. Cardale*, *Mr. Lindsey*, *Dr. Priestley*, *Mr. Wakefield*, and *Mr. Simpson*, he calmly adds, (p. 102,) that this nearly decides the whole controversy, "for if this declaration does not establish the pre-existence of Christ, no other passage can." Undoubtedly: or, rather, he might have said, *no* language can. For with this, of course, he sweeps away at once every passage in which Christ is represented as existing previously to his appearance upon earth; since, like this, all these can only relate to an *existence in the divine purpose;* (p. 103;) and therefore the pre-existence of our Lord, in the usual sense of the word, is a matter that language *cannot* express. (See pp. 55—59, vol. i. of this work.) I need not go farther. It is manifest, that, be the force of expression in the sacred writers what it may, there is a strength of front which far exceeds it.

But, again, in matter even of taste and illustration, no less than in that of reasoning and argument, there is a spirit of paradox, that seems to exercise a perverse ascendancy over the mind of the Unitarian. Otherwise, surely, it never could have occurred to *Mr. Belsham*, in his endeavour to enforce the position, that the texts supporting the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord are "*few in number*," to compare them to "THE STARS IN THE FIRMAMENT." They are, indeed, it must be confessed, "*like the Stars in the firmament*," numerous and bright. They are as Stars set in the firmament of the Heaven, to declare the Majesty of him who dwells there, and the glory of that Great Being whose handiwork those stars are proclaimed to be. *Mr. Belsham*, it is true, intends this comparison, as he informs us, for a very different purpose; and refers to the *Stars*, merely as dazzling the eyes of the spectator, and exciting "the ideas of *number* and *magnitude* far beyond *the reality*." (*Calm Inq.* p. 20.) Surely, it was enough for this gentleman to have blundered as a Rhetorician, and not to have blundered also as an Astronomer. What "*reality*" does the *Calm Inquirer* mean? Does he mean by it the *actual state* of the Stars? It is strange, indeed, if so learned an Astronomer does not know that their *real magnitudes* are millions of times greater than those which they present to our view; and that their *actual number* also, as we have good reason to believe, is vastly greater than what the eye is able to discern. Or, does he mean by "*the reality*," the *appearances* which they offer to the corrected vision of the Astronomer aided by the telescope? This seems an odd application of the word "*reality*." But, here again, he ought to know, that, whilst the apparent magnitudes are diminished by the removal of the irradiation, the number of the visible stars is prodigiously increased; the telescope calling into apparent existence what was undiscoverable to the naked eye. So that when this scientific critic speaks of "the eye of reason aided by philosophy" *reducing* both the number and magnitude of those heavenly bodies to their juster standard, he is every way unfortunate. The *eye* of the ASTRONOMER enables him to add to their *number;* and his *philosophy*, to increase their *magnitude;* and both to a degree which the uninformed cannot readily believe.—And here, also, the parallel holds good. For, to the eye of a well-informed understanding, aided by just principles of criticism and a sound knowledge of the original language of the N. T., the texts which bespeak the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord increase upon the view in number, and in strength, to a prodigious amount. Their individual force, and collective bearings, become infinitely more striking and demonstrative. And, when duly grouped together, like the constellations

by their *Calm Inquirer*, and others of them, individually, that, in *every* instance of deviation from the Archbishop's rendering, acknowledgment is *openly made* in the notes.

Well but, perhaps, this is another instance of mere accidental error "of the pen," or "of the press." If so, it clearly ranks with those *lucky* accidents, which we have had already to notice; for, undoubtedly, it happens most commodiously for the Unitarian. The *Editors*, it must be allowed, have not neglected the *Primate*, on other points, throughout this verse. The words "gracious goodness" immediately preceding those to which we have adverted, he had otherwise rendered in the margin, "grace:" and such is the "scrupulous fidelity" (as *Mr. Belsham* calls it) with which the Editors, *in all cases*, either follow the *Primate* or give notice of their departure from him, that they apprise us of *this momentous* change, in a *special note* upon the subject. Possibly, the *great importance* of this so occupied their attention, that it was altogether diverted from the variation in the remaining part of the sentence; which, indeed, *merely* affected the matter of our Lord's PRE-EXISTENCE; a thing in its own nature so absurd and inconceivable, that, be it expressed in what terms it may, it is well known that no RATIONAL CHRISTIAN can admit even its possibility.

I have, on former occasions, been tempted to travel beyond my immediate and proper subject,—the mere *fact* of unacknowledged departure from the *Primate's* Version,—into the nature of the criticism, by which the *Editors* support their peculiar translation; and I am not able to resist the desire of doing so on the present occasion. I shall follow the very words and order of the *Editors* in their note. "While he was rich—see Wakefield—πλούσιος ὢν ἐπτώχευσε. The con-

into which the Astronomer forms his classes, they spread a brightness and illumination over the face of the Scriptures, like that which these luminaries shed over the firmament of the heavens. I agree then with *Mr. Belsham* as to his *parallel*. The texts, which support the pre-existence and the divinity of our Lord, do indeed resemble "the stars in the firmament." But I differ from him in his *Astronomy*. The stars are, in "*the reality*," more numerous and greater, than they appear; and they are presented to the telescope in greater numbers than to the naked eye.

struction [a] requires it to be understood, not of a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty,

[a] *Mr. Belsham's* profound acquaintance with the Greek language has enabled him to pronounce, in still stronger terms, on the *necessity* of admitting the existence of two contemporary states to have been here intended. "That this is the proper primary meaning of the Apostle's words," he affirms that "no person acquainted with the original can doubt." And he questions "whether the genius of the Greek language will even admit of the sense commonly annexed to the words." (*Calm Inq.* p. 125.) It is whimsical enough, however, that all this extraordinary knowledge of the Greek language, which has enabled *Mr. Belsham* to pronounce thus decisively on what "the construction" so peremptorily "*requires*," has been, as he informs us, the result of a valuable hint from a friend, who, it seems, understands *English* remarkably well, as he has proved "by the accuracy of his remarks upon the English verb." This gentleman, who has written upon the *English verb*, has, we are told, actually assured *Mr. Belsham* that "*the aorist expresses a perfect action in past definite time;* which time is ascertained by the connexion;" and has thus at once proved every thing to his wish, and completely satisfied him that the *genius of the Greek language* "requires that the two states should be simultaneous." And then the whole follows smoothly.—"Christ ἐπτώχευσε, 'was poor.' When?—πλούσιος ὤν, 'at the time he was rich.'" (ibid. p. 124.)—Now, with all due deference, I would recommend *Mr. Belsham* to turn from this gentleman, notwithstanding the knowledge of the *English* language which he may possess, to those who may be somewhat more conversant with the *Greek;* and who possibly may tell him, that, so far is the *Greek aorist* from "expressing a perfect action in past *definite* time," the very essence of the *aorist* is (as its name denotes) its *indefiniteness:* and that, instead of referring always to a "*past* definite time," it is in frequent and common use for a time *not past;* being familiarly employed for *present* time, and not unusually for *future* time also. The force of the Greek aorist, in short, undergoes as many variations as can well be superinduced upon a verb: indicating not only the *future* and the *present*, as well as the *past;* but the past also under various modifications, including those of the common *preterite* and even of the *plusquam perfectum*, according as the connexion may require. It may imply, besides, in some cases, *frequency;* in some, the *continuance* of an action: and it is capable of admitting yet farther varieties, from the *mood* or *voice* in which it may be used, and also from its *participated* application. In a word, this tense, which is said to look to "*past definite time*," may look to *past, present*, or *future*, and has its very essence in the *indefiniteness* of the time and mode in which it can be applied. It has been said, that there is no royal road to Mathematics. This saying may be equally applied to other branches of knowledge. They, I apprehend, can admit no short path either. *Mr. Belsham* may rest assured, that, to know the Greek language, it must be learnt; and that a few general rules, which schoolboys commit to memory, will not convey an acquaintance with the genius of the language.

The Greek, however, which *Mr. Belsham* has derived from this excellent English scholar of his acquaintance, may answer very well for those for whom it is intended. And as *Mr. Belsham* has, in the outset of his work, declared against "*grammatical subtilties*," and has entered his protest against admitting into consideration the "*niceties*" of the Greek language, (under which head the *aorists*, of course, are to be included, no less than the *article*,)

but of two contemporary states. He was rich and poor at the same time."—Now, here the Editors have fortunately di-

he ought not to be pressed closely upon this point. But, although the persons for whom alone he professes to write may not be much acquainted with the Greek language, and the account of the aorist, which he has picked up for their use, may be just as satisfactory to them as any other, yet it is to be supposed they have some knowledge of their own language: and if so, surely the man of "sound understanding" will, at all events, be able to see, that whatever may be said of *Mr. Belsham's Greek*, he has manifestly blundered in *plain English*. For, after telling us that the verb, of which he speaks, must, in virtue of the tense in which he finds it, express a *perfect action* in past definite time, he proceeds to say that the verb must be rendered, "*was poor*." Now, how *being poor* can be called an *action*; and how the words, *was poor*, render this a *perfect action*, Mr. Belsham will, if he can, explain to his reader.—Again, *when* was it that this *perfect action*, 'he WAS POOR,' took place? We are answered, "AT THE TIME that he was rich." Surely *Mr. Belsham* must have forgotten; and has been all this while arguing for the *transition*, not for the *continuance*. We can understand the *perfect action* of a person's *having become poor*, or *having made himself poor*, AT a particular time: but it will require a degree of subtilty, of which Mr. Belsham's man of "sound understanding" may possibly not find himself possessed, to discover a *perfect action*, and an *implied continuance*, in the words "he WAS poor, AT the time that he was rich."

But there is some more Greek of *Mr. Belsham's*, in the same note, which contains a vein of the richest criticism. He says, "it may be objected that πλούσιος ὤν may refer to past time." And this application of the participle present, ὤν, to past time, he strenuously rejects; although he has both here, and elsewhere, when it suited his purpose, admitted the reference to past time in the words πτωχὸς ὤν, in John ix. 25. Under this admission, however, I will take the liberty of considering the sentence somewhat after the model, which he has proposed. "Christ ἐπτώχευσε 'became poor.' When? πλούσιος ὤν, 'at the time that he was rich.'" I ask no more than the benefit of the canon which *Mr. Belsham* has laid down for his own use, and which, as it is found not to suit his purpose, may, since it has been brought forward, be applied to mine. *Mr. Belsham*, however, produces some more Greek, to prove, that John ix. 25. supplies no authority for referring the participle ὤν to *past time*. He contends, that, as the words πτωχὸς ὤν are there followed by the adverb ἄρτι, to "shew that the participle which precedes is to be understood in a preterite sense;" so here, "had the Apostle intended to express, that the state of poverty was subsequent to that of affluence, he would probably have introduced the word εἶτα, or ὕστερον, before the verb ἐπτώχευσε." Whether the Apostle, intending to express an *immediate* transition from one state to the other, would have thought it necessary to introduce either of these words, I leave it to *Mr. Belsham*, (who, it seems, after all, *has* been, *in his own way*, investigating the "*niceties*" of the Greek language,) to determine. But, I fear much, that if the criticism respecting these words be no sounder than that which relates to the word ἄρτι, the Apostle would not have availed himself of the suggestion which it contains, had it been proposed to him. The adverb ἄρτι, we are informed, shows, that the participle is to be understood in a preterite sense. In other words, it expresses the present time so emphatically, as to mark an opposition to *past* time:—"*now* I see." If this discovery of *Mr. Belsham's* be just, it will help us to various new and im-

rected our attention to a few simple points, on which it is not difficult to form a decided judgment. "The construction *re-*

portant views of Scriptural language. When our Saviour says to the Jews, (Matth. xxvi. 53,) "Thinkest thou that I cannot *now*" (ἄρτι, NOW, in opposition to *past* time,) "pray to my Father," &c., our Lord must be supposed to mean, that before this time he could not have done so. Again, when (John xiii. 7) he says to Peter, "What I do, thou knowest not *now*," (ἄρτι,) he must mean, that Peter had now lost the knowledge which at a former time he possessed. It immediately follows, to be sure, "but thou shalt know *hereafter*," as if the opposition here were to *future* time. This, however, is a trifling difficulty in the way of a *Unitarian critic*, and would soon be in some mode or other disposed of. Again, when Peter says, (John xiii. 37,) "Lord, why, cannot I follow thee *now*," (ἄρτι,) he must mean this in comparison with *past* time: although hitherto it has been imagined that he alluded to our Saviour's words, "thou shalt follow me hereafter." In like manner, when our Lord tells his disciples, that he has still many things to say to them, and adds, "ye cannot bear them *now*," (ἄρτι,) he must be understood to imply, that they could have borne them *before* that time, although it has been commonly supposed that the expression looked to the *future*. It will be found also in 1 Cor. xiii. 12; xvi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 7, and in other places, that this lately discovered and significant use of the word ἄρτι, will throw a novel light upon the words of Scripture.—But, (to treat this matter with a seriousness to which, perhaps, it is not entitled) the truth is, that ἄρτι, of itself, simply and properly, though emphatically, signifies the present time; and is only so far opposed to either the past time or the future, as *present* time is opposed to the one or the other; and derives its reference solely from the words with which it is connected in the context; so that, instead of bestowing such reference on, it borrows it from, the sentence in which it stands. If, then, *Mr. Belsham* can find no other reason for rendering the participle in τυφλὸς ὤν in a preterite sense, than the declaration of the *present* possession of sight implied in the word ἄρτι, he will find himself at perfect liberty to render the passage, in a form similar to that which he proposes for this of 2 Corinthians, *I now see* WHILST *I am blind*. Whoever has considered these matters must be well aware, that it is the nature of the subject and the force of the context, and not the mere use of the word ἄρτι, that leads the mind to the immediate admission, that it must be to a *past* time, that the blind man refers the participle, when he uses the words, τυφλὸς ὤν, ἄρτι βλέπω. This will be manifest at once, if we change the word τυφλὸς for another. For example, the Jews had demanded of the blind man's parents, whether it really was their son, (who was well known to have been blind,) that now professed to be restored to sight. Suppose they had put the question to the man himself in this form. "Art thou the son of these persons, and dost thou now see?" ἄρτι βλέπεις; suppose, also, that he, wishing to answer the question precisely, by declaring that he was *their* son, and that he then actually saw, used the words αὐτῶν μὲν ὁ υἱὸς ὤν, ἄρτι βλέπω—must he be thought necessarily to mean, that he *had been at a former time* the son of these persons; or would not, in this case, the participle be taken in the present time, unaffected by the use of the word ἄρτι?—Or, again, if the question had related to his conviction that his sight was permanently restored; and that he meant to reply, that, though he possessed the power of seeing perfectly at the present, he yet had fears as to its continuance for the future; and, in order to convey this, expressed himself in these words, φοβούμενος μὲν (viz.

quires," that the words, πλούσιος ὢν ἐπτώχευσε, should be understood of "two contemporary states—He was rich and

μήποτε τυφλὸς γενώμαι) ἄρτι βλέπω—must the mere use of the word ἄρτι push back his fears lest he might ultimately lose his sight to a time previous to his having recovered it; although, in reality, the present time is here put in opposition to that *future* time to which his fears relate? In these two instances we see, that, according to *Mr. Belsham's* criticism, both that which is declared to exist at the *present*, and that which is meant to refer to the *future*, must be thrown back to a preceding period, by the operation of the adverb ἄρτι.

Had our Lord said of himself, πλούσιος ὤν, ἄρτι πτωχεύω, *Mr. Belsham* would of course admit, that he spoke of two successive states: whilst, by omitting the word ἄρτι here, two concurrent states must, according to him, be intended. This is precisely equivalent to what he has advanced; viz. that there being no particle corresponding to the word ἄρτι, to determine the participle ὤν to the sense of the *preterite*, it *must* consequently be considered in the *present* tense. It should be observed, that the peculiar meaning, which this writer would force upon the word πτωχεύω has nothing to do with the application of his criticism here respecting the word ἄρτι. This criticism, as well as that concerning the force of the *aorist*, stands by itself, on grounds independent of the peculiar force of the verb employed. But, allowing to *Mr. Belsham*, (for the sake of argument,) the full benefit of the force which he assigns to the verb πτωχεύω; namely, that of a continued state, let us see to what this will lead us. If, in consequence of this, the phrase πλούσιος ὢν ἐπτώχευσε, must signify, that he continued rich *whilst* he lived poor; it must of course follow, that St. Paul has represented both to the Ephesians and the Colossians, that, WHILST *continuing dead in their sins*, they were permitted to *live with Christ*, νεκροὺς ΤΟΝΤΑΣ ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι—συνεζωοποίησε. Ephes. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13.—and, again, that St. John, *at the very time* that he was writing the 8th verse of the 22d chapter of the Book of Revelation, was *actually engaged* in *hearing* and *seeing* all those various communications and visions, which he has related to us—Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων ταῦτα καὶ ἀκούων.—Of so little value, indeed, did *Grotius* (the great authority to which the Unitarians are on all occasions anxious to resort) consider such *critical* "*niceties*," as *Mr. Belsham* has here laid down as principles; so little, especially, did he conceive the word ἄρτι to be requisite to give a past sense to the present participle, that he pronounces the very phrase in John ix. 25, which ἄρτι has, according to *Mr. Belsham*, given the *whole* force, to be exactly similar to that in Eph. ii. 5, in which the participle present simply occurs, without any word whatever corresponding to ἄρτι, such as *Mr. Belsham* peremptorily insists upon.—"[Τυφλὸς ὤν] Ὢν, *qui eram*, ut hic *Syrus*. Simile loquendi genus, vide Ephes. ii. 5."—And again, on the passage in the Apocalypse, he says—"Subauditur *sum*, ut sæpe apud Hebræos; et *præsens pro præterito proximo*." This, indeed, St. John has himself put entirely beyond question, by subjoining to the words already quoted, καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα καὶ ἔβλεψα. And, what crowns the whole, and leaves nothing more to be desired upon the subject,—those great Greek critics, who have given us what they are pleased to call the IMPROVED VERSION, have not pronounced St. John to have been ignorant of the genius of the Greek language in doing so; but have actually bestowed their own decisive *imprimatur*, and have given it to us in plain English, "I John SAW these things and HEARD them."—ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων.

Now that I have obtained so high a

poor at the same time."—The *construction* requires no such thing. The plain and unavoidable construction of the words

sanction for the application of the participle present in a preterite sense, without the assistance of the word ἄρτι, or any other particle whatever, I will venture to tell *Mr. Belsham* that nothing is more common; that, to those who are well acquainted with the language, this usage is perfectly familiar; and that the reason of the thing, and the circumstances under which it occurs, are fully explained and defined by various well known writers. Among these writers I would particularly specify *Dr. Middleton*, (*Doct. of the Gr. Art.* pp. 39—44,) and *Glassius*, (*Philol. Sacr.* tom. i. pp. 353—355,)—the latter of whom has accompanied his grammatical remarks upon the participle with some most valuable observations on important passsages of the N. T. in which the participle occurs. I confess, at the same time, that I am disposed to agree with *Mr. Belsham*, in conceding to the participle ὤν, under certain circumstances, an emphatical force which may imply continuance. It is manifest that it may be rendered BEING, in such a sense as shall reach to the nature and essence of the subject. Thus, he who had been born blind, *being* (from nature) *blind*, (that is, such being the state and condition which belonged to him,) declares, that he *now sees*. But, then, *Mr. Belsham* will be pleased to recollect, that this use of the participle involves unavoidably the reference to an antecedent condition, and is, although it implies a *continued state* and appears in a *present form*, as little to be confounded in point of time with the new state affirmed of the subject, as the word *blind* is to be confounded with it in the 17th verse, where the Pharisees are described as interrogating the *blind* man, (λέγουσι τῷ τυφλῷ,) as to the *manner* in which *his sight had been restored*. By his being here called a *blind* man, at the very time when the mode of the acquisition of his sight was the subject of inquiry, what could be meant, but his natural state, and of course, his previous condition; the same which may be conceived to be conveyed by τυφλὸς ΩΝ? In like manner, when our Saviour expresses himself to the disciples of John in these words,—"the *blind* see"—"the *lame* walk,"—(τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι—χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι—) he means, that those, whose nature it had been to be *blind* and *lame*, now saw and walked. He did not think it necessary to introduce any particle, (such as ἄρτι,) to mark the opposition of the two conditions: and yet there does not appear much danger, that any person, from the *excessive* knowledge of Greek that governs *Mr. Belsham's* criticisms, should suppose that these must be two concurring states; and that our Lord had carried the miracle so far, as to enable them to see, *whilst they remained* blind; or to walk, *while they continued* lame;—the species of construction which Mr. Belsham insists upon in the passage before us. The pre-existence of our Lord is, it is to be presumed, a thing so incredible, that any *monstrum cogitationis* is to be received before it: and, therefore, if the above passage happened to bear such relation to that doctrine, as to give it support according to the received mode of its translation, *Mr. Belsham* would, of course, on the principle of interpretation which he wishes to apply to 2 Cor. viii. 9, contend for the *seeing blindness*, and the *walking lameness* to which we have alluded.

Πλούσιος ὤν, then, we may, with strict propriety, render "BEING *rich*"—*being, in his true nature*, rich indeed—ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ πάρχων.—"ΩΝ and 'ΤΠΑΡΧΩΝ here correspond exactly as they ought,—the essence and true nature of the Great Being emphatically expressed in both. All this, it must be confessed, carries with it a reference to past time,—to an antecedent condition. But

πλούσιος ὢν, all the world, except the Unitarian Editors, must admit to be, *Being rich*. Well then, how does the *being rich* that cannot be helped, if truth will have it so. BEING (in his true nature and essence) *rich, he became poor*.—"Being rich, he became poor."—It is manifest, that here is the plain, literal, and consistent interpretation of the passage, without the slightest force exercised on any one part of it, and in exact agreement with all the ordinary, received principles of Scripture interpretation. Whether this be reconcileable with the common translation, "Though he was rich, he became poor," the reader will judge; and "whether *the genius of the Greek language* will admit of this sense," he may now determine for himself. Whether, on the other hand, the principles of "the construction," which "requires, that the two states should be simultaneous," can be received by any "person acquainted with the original," he will probably more than "doubt." That the participle ὢν must, in the first place, express simple *continuance*, of the state expressed by πλούσιος; that, in the second place, ὑπάρχουσι must express simple *continuance* of *its* state likewise; and that, in the third place, the one state must commence, and be exactly concurrent with the other. He could not *have been* rich one moment *before* he was poor:—his riches commenced with his poverty. It was precisely "*whilst* he was rich" that "he was poor." Surely, all this is too much to require us to concede. Independently of all consideration of the original language, I would desire no more for a fair judgment upon the case, than the "sound understanding and honest mind," to which Mr. Belsham *professes* himself so willing to appeal.

It is curious, and may not be uninstructive, to observe the whimsical varieties of *Socinian* criticism, and the capricious changes of shape which it assumes. In former days a grand support of the system which rejected the *divinity* of Christ rested upon the *past* sense of the participle ὤν. *Socinus*, conceiving that this participle has no adsignification of *present* time, was for confining it to the *past;* that he might get rid of the overbearing force of the words, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, in John iii. 13, which he was thus enabled to render, *qui* ERAT *in cœlo;* and, under this interpretation, to afford an explanation, according to his own principles, by which he might avoid the admission of our Lord's pre-existence; as may be seen at p. 160 of this volume. The *present* Socinians having discovered, (see pp. 152, 153. 158,) that "BEING IN HEAVEN" can mean no such thing as it expresses; *because* there is *no heaven:* and that the words merely signify the *being acquainted with the divine counsels*, or no matter what, but certainly NOT *being in heaven*, (for that could not be; besides that "the *natural signification* of words" is, as we have seen at page 108 of this volume, *above all things* to be guarded against,)—have felt themselves altogether relieved from the difficulties of old *Socinus*. They have no longer any occasion for the *past* sense of the participle: and, seeing that the admission of this sense would let in *the pre-existence* upon them elsewhere, (as, for example, in this very passage of 2 Corinthians,) they, accordingly, contend strenuously for the *present* signification, and will have nothing to do with the *past*, which threatens little less than ruin to their scheme. However, these modern critics, who go by no rule but that of *shutting out the Divinity of Christ*, do themselves, at certain times, when off their guard, admit the very interpretation of the participle which they are here so anxious to reject. Thus, (as we have already noticed at p. 150 of this volume,) on John i. 18, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, the *Editors* observe, in their note, that it is better rendered, "who WAS in the beginning with God—to derive instruc-

render it impossible for a man to *become poor?* On the contrary, must not a man *be rich*, in order to admit the propriety

tion," &c., (that is, by the by, as they tell us again, *I. V.* p. 199, "was IN THE WILDERNESS, or ELSEWHERE, to be instructed and disciplined"!)—Here, then, after all, the grand point so long laboured for everywhere else is given up. The participle ὢν may, even according to these great authorities, be taken in the *past* sense: and this, too, it is to be observed, where the *past* time is not superinduced by any connected verb. For it is to be remarked, that, in this passage, the participle is not placed as the nominative to the verb; and therefore it stands independently of the time of that verb. In truth, if, in any part of the N. T. the participle of *existence* is to be considered as peculiarly expressive of *essence;* if there be any, in which no good reason appears for referring the participle to a limited adsignification of time, it is perhaps this very passage. And yet it is almost here alone, that these extraordinary critics would ascribe to it a *past* sense. However, in justice it must be confessed, they make ample and speedy retribution. In return for what they have thus taken *from* the *present* time, they immediately after, (that is, *after* in *their* translation, for they find it convenient, in this first chapter of St. John's Gospel, to turn every thing upside down; and therefore they have, without any authority but their own sole will and pleasure, placed the 15th after the 18th verse,)—they immediately after, I say, in the 15th verse, convert the *past* into the *present*, by construing ἦν, *is;* rendering πρῶτός μου ἦν, "he IS my *principal*," in opposition to the obvious and just translation, "he WAS before me," which has been adopted by every commentator that has hitherto appeared; not excepting even their own great oracles, *Erasmus* and *Grotius*, to whom they affect to appeal on all occasions, but whom they desert, as they do all others, whenever they fail to assist in the main point,—that of reducing our blessed Lord to the ordinary condition of man. Great allowances, undoubtedly, should be made for these Unitarian Critics, in their comments upon this first chapter of St. John. In contemplating this part of Scripture, they seem bewildered to the last degree. They scarcely know what to say: and hardly can any two be found to agree in the same result. The distraction, in truth, which appears to agitate them can scarcely be represented to the imagination by any thing short of the picture which Hogarth has given of the enraged musician. Their incoherences here, then, should perhaps, in some degree, be overlooked. But in other places, where they are not driven to it by the same terrific necessity, we find them without scruple rendering the *present* by the *past*. *Mr. Belsham* labours hard, (by a number of examples, some applicable, and some not,) to establish the admissibility of this in the case of the verb substantive, for the purpose of supporting the Socinian sense of ἐγώ εἰμι, "I WAS *he*," in the celebrated passage (John viii. 58) in which our Lord declares that he existed before Abraham. (See *Calm Inq.* pp. 74, 75. 86, 87. 96. 98.) The *Imp. Vers.* also, in all those places where it might tend to advance the main point, has adopted the same principle of interpretation. Thus we see that the construction which, at one time, these critics reject as inadmissible, at others they adopt with perfect freedom: at all times, however, it must be admitted, in reference to one grand object,—that of robbing Christ of the divinity of his nature. In any case, whatever mode of interpretation favours this object, must be right; although it is to be relinquished, and the opposite mode adopted for the same object, in the succeeding page. Rules of grammar are of no value. One rule only is to

of saying that he *became poor?* Is it impossible that a man, who is rich at *one* time, should become poor at *another?* or is it necessary, that a person, described as *being rich* and *becoming poor*, should be both *rich* and *poor* at the *same time?* Yes, say the Editors, the *construction requires* that the two states should be *contemporary*. To common sense be attended to. All tenses are to be intermixed, all times to be confounded; provided only that that exalted Being, the Son of God, who fills all time, shall be confined to such a portion of it as falls to the lot of mere, miserable, mortal man.

Of these contradictory and mutually subversive positions, respecting the force of Greek tenses, abundant instances have been already derived from *Mr. Belsham* and his brother editors. But one still remains, which I have purposely reserved for the conclusion of this note. We have seen that the great stress of *Mr. Belsham's* grammatical argument in support of the Unitarian rendering of 2 Cor. viii. 9, depends upon the construction of the aorist under that peculiar reference to *past time*, which we have quoted from him page 255 of his book, and which, as we have noticed, he exults in having derived from a learned friend, inasmuch as by it he considers himself enabled to decide the question of the sense of the disputed passage. Now what shall we say, if we find this same writer asserting of the aorist of a particular verb, that it "occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament; and in *five passages only* signifies *past* time?" Yet this he does of the verb γενέσθαι; because the applying to it a future sense furnishes one of the Unitarian modes of escaping the inference of our Lord's pre-existence from John viii. 58. It is not, indeed, the particular mode of escape, which this writer has selected as the best; but it is one which he mentions with respect, and something like commendation; and, so far as the criticism on the verb γενέσθαι is concerned, manifestly with approbation. So that at the beginning of this note we find this writer, at the suggestion of *one* friend, maintaining the *necessity* of the *past sense* for the Greek aorist; and at the conclusion of it we leave him in the full possession of an opposite suggestion from *another* friend, which completely overturns the former. How the critic is to act between the two descriptions of learned friends, how to choose *between the two bundles*—I know not.

Before I quit the subject of *tenses*, on which this note has been principally employed, I shall add this one remark on the text last alluded to;—that the only contrivances, by which Unitarians are able to evade its force, are the changes of the *past* into the *future*, or of the *present* into the *past*. Πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι. — Before Abram SHALL BECOME (*Abraham*), I am (*he*): — or, Before Abraham was born, I WAS (*he*). In the former, γενέσθαι is made *future:* in the latter, εἰμὶ is made to signify the *past*. The plain and simple translation is by all means to be avoided by Unitarian critics. But may not expositors of inferior lights, avail themselves of both the great contending authorities; and with the one be permitted to render γενέσθαι in the *past* sense, and εἰμὶ in the *present* sense with the other? And thus even Unitarian criticism may be made to minister to the truth, and to give support to that great fundamental TRUTH, the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. On this text in John viii. 58, see what has been already said, at pp. 55—57, vol. i. of this work.

this seems somewhat odd. But it appears evident, they say, from the words, πλούσιος ὢν, which they choose to render, WHILE *he was rich*. The word WHILE establishes the whole for them; proves that the two states must be concurrent; and settles the entire question of construction at once. This word, however, unfortunately, is altogether of their own manufacture, or rather that of *Mr. Wakefield;* and has been forced in here, against all just principles of criticism, to help out that very construction, which, they say, requires it. The original, as we have seen, simply expresses, *Being rich*. That the word WHILE has no place in it, is manifest: and that there can be no *pretence* for its introduction, shall be shown hereafter. But, for the present, let it be observed that, even admitting the translation of the Editors, *while he was rich*, it will not follow, that the sentence must be understood of two contemporary states, so long as the word ἐπτώχευσε signifies *he became poor*, and thereby marks a transition from one state to the other. They seem to think, indeed, that the word *while* precludes this rendering of the verb ἐπτώχευσε; and, for this reason, they have caught eagerly at the authority of *Mr. Wakefield*, for the introduction of that particle. Now it fortunately happens, that *Mr. Wakefield* himself, their favourite critic, is the very authority I have to adduce upon this subject. What is *his* rendering of the clause? "*While* he was rich[a], he *became* poor." See his *Translation of the New Testament*. *Mr. W.* must be

[a] The Editors have made their quotation from this writer with no small degree of judgment. It stands thus, as we have seen at page 180.—"While he was rich—see Wakefield—πλούσιος ὢν, ἐπτώχευσε."—The part of the sentence, which is broken off, and by which the last of these three Greek words is rendered, would have spoiled all:—"*he* BECAME *poor*," would have let in orthodoxy again, whereas the part quoted bade fair to thrust it out. Now, this is a specimen of *Unitarian quotation:* and this too, on a subject, on which the departure from truth is the stifling of God's revelation. *Mr. Wakefield's* criticisms may be of but little value: and, for my own part, I have not been in the habit of rating them at much. But not so with the Editors. With them he is oracular. Or, be it that I state this too strongly, yet, at all events, to quote his words as *bearing on the sacred text*, and to quote them *falsely*, is dealing treacherously with THE WORD OF GOD, and is but too well worthy of the cause, in which *they* are engaged, who would *blaspheme* the Majesty of the SON OF GOD.

supposed, if we would acquit him of a gross blunder in language and a gross confusion of ideas, to have here employed the word *while*, in the sense of *when, at a time when:* for, to conceive it as implying a lengthened space, would be to make the *point of time*, *at* which he *became* poor, commensurate with a *portion of time*, *during* which he *continued* rich. I do not say, that I should approve of such a form of expression. But it is the one adopted by him, whom the Unitarians look up to as their greatest scholar; and whatever objection can be brought against it, is to be applied to the word *while*, which he and they have unjustifiably forced upon the sentence; the use of which, however, could not prevent *Mr. W.* from giving to the verb πτωχεύω[a] the sense

[a] It may be said that, in his *Inquiry*, *Mr. Wakefield* has rendered πτωχεύω in the sense of *being*, not of *becoming poor*, and has there considered the whole passage as treating of simultaneous, not successive states. To this I answer, it signifies nothing to the present point in what manner he has translated the word, or understood the passage, *there;* although, *even there*, he has only ventured to say of πτωχεύω, after reciting the usual rendering *to become poor*, that it "RATHER means to be in the *condition* and *capacity* of a *poor* man." (p. 179.) We are at present concerned not with that work, but with his *Translation of the New Testament;* the second edition of which (the only one in my possession) was published *eleven* years *later* than the *Inquiry;* and in which, of course, we have the final result of his best judgment upon the subject. To this later work the Editors have referred, by their quotation, for the support of his authority in rendering the words πλούσιος ὤν, "WHILE *he was rich.*" So that on every account, to *this* work our attention must be necessarily confined.—The Editors, indeed, must have been much puzzled, as to which of the two productions of this great Unitarian authority they should abide by. They would naturally prefer the former, as rendering πτωχεύω in the sense of BEING *poor:* but then, the first clause of the translation did not furnish them with the governing emphasis of the particle WHILE, as πλούσιος ὤν was *there* rendered, BEING *poor*. On the other hand, in the later production of this author, the word WHILE was employed; but then the orthodox sense of the verb ἐπτώχευσε (*became poor*) was retained. The Editors, in this difficulty, adopted the most *prudent* plan. They followed the latter, in the first clause; and totally sunk the remainder, as we have seen in the preceding note. At the same time, that the Unitarian sense of the word πτωχεύω, advanced in the *Inquiry*, should not be lost, it was deemed right that in a separate work, which is, in truth, but a supplement, or body of notes, to the Unitarian Version, the translation as given in the *Inquiry* should be exclusively enforced. Whilst, therefore, the Editors refer only to *Mr. Wakefield's New Testament*, and select from that *just* what answers their immediate purpose; *Mr. Belsham* refers only to that writer's *Inquiry*, and secures to the cause the additional aid that was to be *thence* derived. *Calm Inq.* p.

of *becoming poor:* a sense which at once overturns the whole fabric of their construction.—Well then, thus far, the Editors do not appear to be particularly fortunate, in the observations, with which they commence. The translation, "*while* he was rich," does *not* appear to be the just rendering of the words πλούσιος ὢν:—the construction does *not require* to be understood of two contemporary states:—and *Mr. Wakefield*, whom they appeal to in the very frontispiece of their note, and whose name stands in the place, that, according to their engagements, should have been occupied by that of *Newcome*, turns out to be an authority *decisively against* them.

But, in truth, the grand hinge of the question is the meaning of the verb ἐπτώχευσε. It is useless to talk of *two contemporary states*, until it be determined whether there be, in strictness, *two* STATES spoken of at all. The Editors, not being able to rid themselves of a lurking feeling on this head, although they profess to have settled the point already by the force of the word WHILE, proceed to fix the sense of the verb πτωχεύω, agreeably to the interpretation of the passage, which they have already resolved on: and having cited the Lexicons[a] of *Stephanus* and *Constantine*, for the use of the verb

125.—Let not the mean opinion that the reader may entertain of *Mr. Wakefield* as a critic and a theologian induce him to discredit the idea, that so much machinery should be employed for such a purpose as that of obtaining the apparent sanction of his name. It should be remembered that there is a class of men, by whom an author with *any* pretensions to the distinction of a *scholar*, and at the same time lending his authority to the support of their opinions, may reasonably be deemed a paragon: and it is known, that there are writers, and translators, with whom such machinery is no novelty, and who can lose no character by resorting to it.

[a] The quotations from these Lexicons are, like most of the Unitarian quotations, *ad captum* merely. Advantage is taken of a partial and seeming correspondence, whilst every expression that marks a departure is carefully suppressed. The object with the Lexicons here quoted has been more to convey the full force of the word πτωχὸς carried into act by the verb, than to distinguish (if I may so say) the precise *verbal* modification, as to the point of continuance or change. The *Editors* have omitted to mention, among the interpretations assigned in each of these Lexicons, the word *mendico:* which, as it implies simply an *act*, and does not in itself *necessarily* include the idea of a *continued state*, or *course of action*,—(any more than the word ἰκαίτω, or *stipem peto*, to which both the Lexicons, after *Hesychius*, make πτωχεύω sometimes equivalent,)—it would not have suited the purpose of the *Editors* to have particularly noticed. The Latin terms, it must be observed, by which the Greek verb is explained, are

in the senses of "mendicus sum," "mendicus vivo," "inops dego," and *Erasmus*, for the sense of "pauper fuit sive *potius*

equivocal in their application. Indeed, if it were not so, the argument of the *Editors* would go to the length of proving that the word πτωχεύω, in the judgment of the compilers of these Lexicons, could *never* be applied in the sense of BECOMING *poor*. Now, this would be to brand their own authorities with gross ignorance: an ignorance, however, of which the learned authors would soon be acquitted by those who would take the trouble to examine what they say for themselves. For we find in the former of the two Lexicons, the passage of *Nazianzen*, πτωχεύει τὴν ἐμὴν σάρκα, rendered by the words, "ob meam carnem *pauper* FIT;" and in the latter we have the same translation acknowledged as assigned to this Greek sentence. Again, with respect to the very text in question, (2 Cor. viii. 9,) we find, that although the word *eguit* has been used by both for ἐπτώχευσε, yet *Stephanus*, who has adopted the translation of *Constantine*, but in a form more copious and explanatory, immediately subjoins what manifestly shows that he understood the word to imply a *change* of condition,—"*Usus autem eo verbo est* Apostolus, ut *ostenderet* eum (Christum scil.) usque ad extremam etiam paupertatem nostrâ causâ SESE DEMISISSE"—*had humbled himself, had reduced himself.* See *Thes.* vol. 3. p. 587. And this same *Stephanus*, in his *Concordance*, (which, it should be remembered too, was not published for more than twenty years after his *Thesaurus*,) assigns to the verb πτωχεύω, as its single and sole signification, the words "*pauper* FIO," *to* BECOME *poor*. It seems rather odd, that the *Editors*, whose object was the translation of the *Greek of the New Testament*, should have altogether *forgotten* to look into the *Concordance*, in which *Stephanus* professes to give the meaning of the *Greek of the New Testament;* and in which he gives the latest result of his judgment,—a book, too, which they themselves recommend, in the Introduction to their Version, for the interpretation of the New Testament: and, also, that they should have *forgotten* even to glance at the observations which we have quoted from both *Stephanus* and *Constantine*, in those very parts of their Lexicons from which they have favoured us with extracts. In truth, it is perfectly manifest, that, so far as the *Editors*' assertion, that the word πτωχεύω *cannot properly* signify a *change* of state, is concerned, the authority of these writers is decidedly against them.

As to the Lexicons, generally, it should be remarked, that they represent the word πτωχὸς, as in itself implying a *change* of condition. *Schleusner* explains the word, "*pauper, ad mendicitatem* REDACTUS," &c. *Suidas* defines πτωχὸς,—"ὁ ἐκπεπτωκὼς τοῦ ἔχειν," "qui ex bonorum possessione excidit:" and "πτωχεία,—παντελὴς τῆς κτήσεως ἔκπτωσις." *Suicer* in like manner, "Πτωχὸς PROPRIE est, ὁ ἀπὸ πλούτου καπίλεων εἰς ἰνδιείαν, *qui ex divitiis ad inopiam* DEVOLUTUS EST." (*Thes. Eccles.* p. 887.) Amongst other derivations assigned to the word, that of πτόω (*cado*) an obsolete for πίπτω, and from which πίπτω takes its preterite πέπτωκα, is the most prevalent and the most probable. And, in this view, the primary sense of the word πτωχὸς, and consequently of πτωχεύω, ought to imply a *change* of state, a *fall* from wealth. The great attention bestowed by the Lexicons generally, upon the *extreme degree of poverty* expressed by the word πτωχεύω, and upon the distinction to be observed between πτωχὸς and πένης, seems to be the reason why the primary sense has been in most cases especially dwelt upon, and the peculiar force of the *verb*, as relating to an *existing* or a *commencing* state, (a *continuance* or a *change* of

mendicavit;"[a] they then at once peremptorily conclude,—"the word properly signifies an actual state, not a change of condition,) has not been more fully taken into consideration; but left, as it naturally ought, to be determined by the particular bearing of the context. So far as the *verb* merely is concerned, πτωχὸς, *sum* et *fio* (in the form given by *Schleusner*) seems to be its just representation. And it is worthy of remark, that if πτωχὸς itself implies a change of condition, *ad mendicitatem redactus*, then even the acceptation of the verb in the form of πτωχὸς *sum*, must imply the same.

[a] *Erasmus* has been extremely brief upon this, having simply stated his rendering of the Greek to be, as quoted above, "pauper fuit, sive *potius* mendicavit." *Mendicavit*, then, is the sense which he *prefers* for the word ἐπτώχευσε: and he even follows it up by saying, "ut hinc possent argumentum sumere qui gaudent *mendicitatem* suam ad Christum autorem referre:" alluding to the model, to which the Mendicant orders of the Romish clergy might refer, as their example. Now, I would ask the Editors, why they have not abided by their own authority here, and rendered the Greek word in the strict sense *mendicavit*, instead of adopting the translation agreeable to that sense which *Erasmus* holds to be *inferior*. They may say, perhaps, that they quote *Erasmus*, merely to show, that he understood the word to imply an actual state, and not a change of state. At all events, then, they do not deem his judgment such as should be implicitly relied upon, in his criticism upon this verse. But are they sure that *Erasmus* meant, by the word *mendico*, to *exclude* a change of state? Are they sure that *Erasmus* did not prefer the word *mendico, because* it might, like the Greek word, apply to the commencement, as well as to the continuance, of the course of action which it expressed? The verb *mendico, Facciolati*, in his excellent Lexicon, renders by *pitoccare* from *pitocco*, which words are manifestly the transfusion of the Greek words πτωχεύω and πτωχὸς, and the word *pitoccare* is known to be employed not only in the sense, *to beg*, but also to *go a begging*, to *become a beggar*. So that the word *mendico*, according to this authority, by no means excludes the idea of a *change of condition*. But, even though the Latin of *Erasmus* were unequivocally in their favour, yet, against the stream of authorities, which oppose him upon this subject, his simple *dictum* could be but of little force. *Erasmus*, it is to be remembered, lived but at the revival of letters, and was destitute of those many important aids to Greek literature, which have been furnished since his time. He was a scholar, *proprio Marte*; and although, undoubtedly, a man of vast genius and extensive learning, and of infinitely attractive wit, yet, in his *Greek* criticisms especially, he has been esteemed by many extremely fallible. Even *Jortin*, with all the partiality of a biographer who imagined that the historian bore some resemblance to his subject, admits the general suffrage of "his deficiency in the Greek tongue." (*Life of Erasmus*, vol. ii. p. 160.) *Erasmus* himself, indeed, in his note on Mark ii. 9, makes plain confession of his inferiority in Greek literature. *Marianus Victorius*, in the preface to his Edition of *Jerome*, goes too far, when he charges him roundly with a total ignorance of the language. *John Hales* speaks not quite so strongly when he says, in his notes on *Chrysost. Homil. in Hebr.*, "Acumen Erasmianæ censuræ et certitudinem, quam in *Latinis* præstat, in *Græcis* PRORSUS DESIDERO."—Whatever justice there may be in this observation, as it relates to his Greek criticisms generally; there can be no question, as to its application, in those cases, in which a knowledge of the Hebrew was also necessary; that is, as to its application to the Greek lan-

state. Literally he was poor, or he was a beggar. See Odyss. O. v. 308."—Thus the point is completely settled. The sense, which the construction, under the influence of the particle WHILE, would have given to the verb, is now proved to belong to it from an independent source. And so the question is set at rest.

Yet a word or two remain to be said. We cannot allow these critics to travel off so rapidly. We are here informed, that the word πτωχεύω "*properly* signifies an actual state, not a change of state:"—that is, that it means the actual state of BEING *poor*, and that it *cannot*, *properly*, signify to BECOME *poor*. We cannot avoid remarking, here, how strangely ignorant *Schleusner* must be upon this subject; notwithstanding the high estimation in which he is held by the Editors, and their great readiness to quote his authority whenever they can contrive to *pick out* any thing from him that will afford the colour of a sanction to their opinions. How does *he* explain the word?—"1. proprie: *pauper sum* et FIO, *ad mendicitatem* REDACTUS SUM, *mendico*, a πτωχὸς, quod vide:" and then he adduces a number of references, the first of which is "Odyss. O. v. 308," the very one which the Editors have put forward [a], and which, in their lighter reading, they

guage in use among the Jewish writers. *Drusius*, in the preface to his *Præterita in Nov. Test.*, expressly informs us that he has thus entitled his criticisms on the New Testament, as having special reference to what had been *passed over*, or not sufficiently illustrated, by others; among whom he names *Erasmus* as the principal. This commentator possessed that which *Erasmus* wanted. His perfect acquaintance with the Hebrew, the Jewish writers, the ancient Greek translators, and the productions of the Fathers, afforded him such eminent qualifications for commenting upon the sacred text, that *P. Simon* does not scruple to pronounce him the *most learned and judicious* critic in the whole assemblage of those distinguished Commentators on the Old Testament, whose labours are preserved to us in the collection entitled *Critici Sacri*. See *Hist. Crit. du V. T.* liv. 3. ch. 15. The *Editors* have not informed us in what sense this writer, who has had *Erasmus* specially in his view throughout his comment on the N. T., has interpreted the word in question. They were not anxious to state, that the reviser of the criticisms of *Erasmus*, whilst he dwells at some length upon the comparison of *egenus* and *pauper*, in his comment on the verse before us, lays it down as a matter which *does not come at all into question*, that *factus est* is connected with both. *Egenus* FACTUS EST.—*Pauper* FACTUS EST.

[a] It is to be observed that the passage in *Homer* has been adduced by *Schleusner*, as an instance of the pro-

must have discovered in the *Odyssey* for themselves; as it is not to be supposed, that they would have selected this single

priety of the sense of, *ad mendicitatem redactus sum, mendico;* having in view simply the force of the word πτωχὸς *mendicus,* and not any modification of the act expressed by the verb, in reference to a change or continuance of state. This, as has been before observed, has been the main object with the Lexicographers and Commentators in general upon this word; the *extreme poverty,* which the word implies, being the idea principally held in view. That *Schleusner,* then, has cited the passage from the *Odyssey,* as equally applicable to the sense of *ad mendicitatem redactus sum,* and to that of *mendico;* and therefore (*were it even* granted, that *mendico* must necessarily imply the *continuance* of a state, and can never be attributed to the *first act* or *commencement*) that he has connected the sense of BECOMING *a beggar,* equally as that of BEING *one,* with the example which he has quoted from *Homer,* is manifest on a moment's inspection. The *Editors,* on the other hand, have cited the very same example from *Homer,* for the purpose of showing the direct contrary; namely, that the word πτωχεύω *cannot properly* signify a *change* of state. Now, although I have above acquitted these critics of having derived this reference from *Schleusner,* upon the ground, that they could scarcely be supposed to have overlooked or suppressed the notice of the matter supplied by that learned writer in direct opposition to their assertions; yet, on second thoughts, I see much stronger reasons for believing, that from *his* Lexicon they did actually transcribe this reference. The mere circumstance of overlooking or suppressing may easily be admitted, where practices of a much higher order of disingenuousness are found to be familiar. And, although it must be admitted, that other Lexicons, as well as that of *Schleusner,* contain the allusion to *Homer,* yet the precise form of the quotation here supplies an internal evidence of the source. One thing is certain, that if these critics had been searching through the Odyssey, for the purpose of discovering an application of the verb πτωχεύω, which would least serve their purpose, they would have cited the very one that has been adduced, inasmuch as its actual application here implies decidedly a *change* of state; Ulysses declaring his intention to assume the appearance of a new condition, and being now for the first time to *become* a beggar,—πτωχεύσων. In four other passages of the *Odyssey,* they might have discovered the word, in an aspect not equally unfavourable to their position; at the same time, it is certain, that neither there, nor elsewhere, can they possibly discover any thing, that would justify their assertion, that "the word *properly* signifies an actual state, and not a change of state." Thus it appears, that the Editors did not search out this example for themselves; and that, in truth, they did not know to what precise point of explanation it was adduced in the Lexicon from which they took it. The sound of *Homer's* name would convey a grace; and might intimate something like an acquaintance with the Classics. Whether *Homer* or any of the ancient Classics have usually formed a part of the early studies of *Hackney,* or those other seminaries in which the *Editors* and their brethren have received their education, I know not. But they seem generally unfortunate, when they venture upon Classic ground. And, indeed, it may be said, that whenever they wander beyond the range of such names as *Priestley, Evanson, Lindsey, Cappe,* and *Wakefield,* who may be called the *Unitarian Classics,* they are almost always sure to meet with some mishap. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam,* is, in many cases, a wholesome suggestion.

note from *Schleusner*, and have passed over in perfect silence the various remaining matter, which contradicts their assertion as to the import of the verb in question. Some of the authorities, to which *Schleusner* refers, show the like ignorance with himself; since, like him, they employ the word πτωχεύω in a sense implying a *change* of state. The LXX, he says[a], make use of it in different places in the sense of

[a] Alexandrini adhibent hanc vocem pro רוּשׁ, pauperem *factum esse*, indigere "—" נוּרשׁ idem "—" et דלל ad inopiam *redactus est.*" *Schleusner* refers to but four passages, in which the word occurs in the LXX: but there are six instances, including one in the Apocrypha: and, in *every one* of these, the word occurs, in the sense of a *transition* from opulence to poverty, or from a state of possession to one of privation. In no other passages, except the one before us, is the word πτωχεύω to be found, throughout the whole of the sacred writings. The passages are Judges vi. 6; xiv. 15; Ps. xxxiv. 10; lxxix. 8; Prov. xxiii. 21; and Tobit iv. 21. In the first and fourth of these, the corresponding Hebrew word is דלל, rendered *attenuor* by both *Trommius* and *Biel*, "*entirely exhausted*" by *Parkhurst*, and in the same sense by all the Lexicons; and this sense is indispensably requisite, from the context, in both the passages referred to. In the second, third, and fifth, we have the corresponding Hebrew word רשׁשׁ; which, in its general acceptation, signifies, to REDUCE, or BE REDUCED TO, *extreme poverty:* and from the particular form of the verb as it occurs in these passages, as well as from the force of the context, it manifestly and unequivocally signifies the BEING made, or BECOMING, *poor*.—*Jerome*, who must be supposed tolerably acquainted with the force both of the word πτωχεύω, and of the original terms which the LXX have rendered by that word in these several passages, had used for it, in his translation of those passages taken in the order in which they have been cited, the following expressions, "*humiliatus est*" — "*spoliaretis nos*" — "*Divites egerunt*"—"*pauperes facti sumus*" — "*consumentur*"—in all of which, it is obvious, that this learned Father and admirable critic has conveyed the sense of a *change of condition.*

With respect to the sense, then, in which the verb πτωχεύω has been employed by the LXX, in these several passages, we have the joint testimony of the original Hebrew, of *Jerome's* translation, and of the unequivocal force of the context. To the remaining passage in the Apocryphal book of Tobit, we cannot apply the same accumulated evidence; because we are not possessed of the Hebrew or Chaldee original; and because, from whatever reason, the *Vulgate* translation of this book has, in such a variety of respects, so little accordance with the *Greek* text. But yet, it is not less certain from the context, which relates entirely to the *change of condition* of the afflicted Tobit and his family, that the use of the word πτωχεύω, here, is, as we have found it elsewhere; and that the rendering of the Received Version, *made poor*, is the true one.—Agreeably to what has been said of the verb in question, we find it rendered, in our common translation, in the sense of *being made poor*, or *becoming poor*, in every one of the passages which have been enumerated, excepting only in that of Psalm xxxiv: in which, by following the Hebrew literally, whilst it was viewed as figurative by the Greek translators, they have rendered the noun in the original by *Lions*, instead of πλούσιοι or *the Rich*; and have, consequently, been led to

being MADE *poor*, and *being* REDUCED *to indigence*. How ignorant also must *Suicer* have been, who, in his translation of the following passages from *Basil* and *Theophanes*, has rendered the word, in like manner, most decisively in the sense of *becoming*, or *making one's self poor?* "Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, οἵτινες οὐ δι' ἄλλην τινὰ αἰτίαν ἐπτώχευσαν, κ. τ. λ. Hi sunt pauperes spiritu, qui non aliam ullam ob causam *pauperes* FACTI SUNT," &c.—"πτωχοὺς νοητέον τῷ πνεύματι, τοὺς πάντων τῶν ἐν κακίᾳ νοουμένων ἑκουσίως πτωχεύσαντας, κ. τ. λ.—per pauperes spiritu intelligendi sunt, qui omnibus quæ sub malitiæ intellectum cadunt voluntarie SESE PRIVANT, &c. (*Thes. Eccles.* vol. ii. pp. 888, 889.) [We have already seen, in the note at page 192, that this learned writer considers a *change of condition* to be implied in the very word πτωχός.] *Parkhurst* also has betrayed similar ignorance by explaining the verb as signifying "to be, or *become*, poor."

Now, the Editors have recommended to their readers, as the best guides to the meaning of the Greek of the New Testament, the Lexicons of *Schleusner*, *Suicer*, *Parkhurst*, and *Mintert*. The last named I have not in my possession.

translate the verb by a word, that does not necessarily imply a *change* of condition. At the same time, it should be observed, that *Arias Montanus*, looking always to the literal sense of the original, renders the verb here by *depauperati sunt*; although, like our English translators, he conceived himself bound to abide by the word *Lions*, with which that meaning of the verb but ill assorts. The marginal annotators of our Bible, also, by referring Luke i. 53 ("the hungry he hath filled with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away," ἐξαπέστειλε κενούς,) to this very passage of the xxxivth Psalm, clearly mark their judgment of its true interpretation; and concur in the sense, which is elsewhere uniformly given by our English translators to the verb πτωχεύω. It may not be amiss to notice, that the only fragment of the later Greek Interpreters of the O. T. (*Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus*) that remains to us, in which any instance occurs of the use of the verb πτωχεύω, is one of *Symmachus*, on Prov. xiii. 7: and in that, *beyond all possibility of question*, (both from the context and the force of the form *Hithpahel* in the original,) the *change of condition from rich to poor* is expressed. The verb is, indeed, used by *Symmachus* in the middle voice; but that merely gives it a *reciprocal* import; affecting only the *subject* of the action, not the *nature* of the act. Thus, then, we are provided with proof, as to the sense, in which the word πτωχεύω was understood, by the Jewish Greek translators of the O. T. both before and after the age in which the Gospels and Epistles were written,

But we see how far the remaining Lexicons justify the position that the word πτωχεύω "*properly* signifies an actual state, and NOT *a change of state*." And we see also the reason, why the Editors have not, on the present occasion, resorted to *any one* of the Lexicons which they have specially prescribed to the Student of the Greek Testament, but wander off to glean what they can, for their purpose, from the general Lexicons of *Stephanus* and *Constantine*:—why they turn also to *Erasmus*, for the very scanty pittance of his aid upon this subject, and travel (so as to equal the travellings of *Ulysses* himself) even into the *Odyssey*, for a favourable exposition of this untoward text. It has been seen, however, that *Stephanus* and *Constantine* have been used, as Unitarian authorities generally are, and as we have found Mr. Wakefield treated upon the same subject, without any very scrupulous regard to what they themselves actually say: and that as to their *application* of the word πτωχεύω, so far from yielding the Editors support, these very names may actually be marshalled against them. As for the assistance which, in their dearth of critical aid, they labour to derive from *Erasmus* and *Homer*, the reader, after what has been said, will not find it difficult to appreciate *its* amount.

But we have that to appeal to, which, on every question of this nature, is the most decisive criterion. The use of the Greek language among the Jews is properly to be learned from themselves: and, from comparing Scripture Greek with itself, it has been at all times acknowledged, that we are most likely to arrive at the true acceptation of any word or phrase, in the Greek of either the New Testament or the Old. The verb πτωχεύω occurs in no passage of the *N. T.* but that which is at present under consideration. In the writings of the *Old Testament*, including the Apocrypha, it occurs, as we have seen in a preceding note, in not less than six passages; in every one of which it directly expresses, or obviously implies, that, which the Editors affirm it *cannot properly* signify,—a *change* of state: it is applied, also, (as we have seen, p. 197 n.,) in the same sense by *Symmachus*, the only one of the

later Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, whose use of it is to be found in the fragments of their Versions which remain to us: and *Jerome*, not only, (as has been noticed at p. 196 n.,) confirms the use of the word throughout the Old Testament, by his concurring interpretation of the corresponding Hebrew; but assigns to it, expressly, this signification, in his rendering of the word in the very passage with which we are concerned, in the New: so that the use of the word πτωχεύω, in Jewish Greek, seems to be placed beyond question, and might be deemed sufficient,—even though in the *general* application of the word by Greek writers it were employed equally in the sense of BEING and of BECOMING, *poor*,—to justify us in pronouncing, that in the latter sense exclusively it was understood among the Jews.

Of the justice of this remark, *Stephanus*, one of the principal authorities to which the Editors have appealed, affords a striking confirmation; for, although, in his general Lexicon, he had attributed to the word a sense that might be conceived to imply an actual state, rather than a change of state, yet, when he afterwards came to compile his *Concordance* for the *New Testament*, he confines the word (as we have seen at p. 192) specially to the signification of BECOMING *poor*. This, too, is the more marked and unequivocal, because, in the preface to his *Concordance*, he distinctly states that it had been his particular care, when any word admits more interpretations than one, (meaning, of course, in its Scripture application,) to assign them all: and yet to this he assigns the single interpretation, "*pauper* FIO." We see, then, how the *Scripture* use of the word πτωχεύω appeared, even to those who conceived that, in its general signification, it was not to be confined to a change of state.

As to the Scripture sense of the word πτωχεύω, we have a still higher authority than that of *Stephanus*, or of any modern scholar, however distinguished. The *Syriac* translators of the New Testament must be allowed to be sufficient witnesses as to the meaning of the Greek in use among their own countrymen in *their* day; which, by the confession of

all, could not be far removed from the age of the Apostles. Now we have their authority for asserting, in the most decisive terms, that the word πτωχεύω is, in the passage before us, to be rendered in the sense of *being made*, or *becoming*, *poor*[a].

We have, then, for this use of the word πτωχεύω among Jewish writers, the authority of the *LXX*, of the *Syriac* translators of the New Testament, and of *Symmachus*. We have also the authority of *Jerome*. So that it seems to be placed almost beyond the possibility of doubt, that, with the Jewish writers, for a considerable period of time both preceding and following the date of St. Paul's Epistle, the word πτωχεύω was familiarly employed in the sense of *being made*, or *becoming*, poor. This is a sense of the word *admitted* by all Greek writers: the very derivation afforded by some Lexicons attributing *even to its primitive* the force of a *change of condition*. But, whilst admissible in the general use of Greek writers, it seems to be the prevalent (*if not exclusive*) application of the *verb*, according to the usage of the Greek among the Jews. The ablest Greek scholars have adopted this application of the verb, in Jewish and Ecclesiastical Greek; even where they have explained the word generally, so as to admit, upon an equal footing, the sense

[a] The Syriac translation of the word ἐπτώχευσε in 2 Cor. viii. 9, is ܐܬܡܣܟ; which, being in the conjugation *Ethpaal*, (corresponding to the Hebrew *Pyhal*,) puts the matter out of dispute, as to the meaning of the word, in the acceptation of the *Syriac* translators. Accordingly, we find the various Syriac Lexicons of *Schindler*, *Trostius*, *Gutbirius*, and *Schaaf*, interpreting this word in the most emphatical manner, *pauper* FACTUS EST. Indeed, it is to be remarked, that the particular verb, here employed in the Syriac, has no conjugation implying *pauper fuit*, or the simple state of *being poor*; but always carries with it a *change of condition*; it being a quadriliteral, and from its nature and import wanting the conjugation *Peal*, and occurring in its earliest form in that of *Pael*, or in the sense of *depauperavit*: as the Chaldee, which agrees with the Syriac, applies the word מסכן in 1 Sam. ii. 7, and other places where the sense of a *change of condition* is inevitable.—This last named passage, indeed, furnishes perhaps the most decisive instance of the force of the two Syriac words ܡܣܟ and ܥܬܪ, and their corresponding Chaldee מסכן and עתר; which are the words applied here to convey the Greek πτωχίζει and πλουτίζει, *makes rich*, and *makes poor*.—See p. 205.

ascribed to it by the Editors. Of this *Suicer*, *Stephanus*, and *Schleusner*, afford striking examples. The authority of the first two, as to the scriptural and ecclesiastical use of the verb, has been noticed before. *Schleusner* we shall find (in addition to what has been already adduced from him) to be most explicit and decisive as to St. Paul's application of the verb in the passage before us.—"δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσε, vestrûm causâ in DETERIORI CONDITIONE in his terris vixit"—"vestrûm causâ PAUPER FACTUS EST."

In the same sense,—that of a *change* of condition,—we find almost every authority on the use of the verb in *this* passage uniformly concurring. If we turn to the *English* translators, whether we take the *Rhemish*, or the authors of our own successive Versions, it is still the same. To satisfy the taste of Unitarians, we can produce the authorities even of *Locke* and of *Wakefield*. Not that I would class these two translators together; but as *Wakefield* is their own, and *Locke* they pretend to claim as such, it may be well to cite both at once for *their* satisfaction. By the former the word is here rendered, MADE HIMSELF *poor;* and by the latter, BECAME *poor*.

But what shall we say, if St. Paul himself expressly informs us of the sense in which he has used the word? And if, in a passage, which is (and must be) allowed by all[a], to be

[a] That these two passages are exactly parallel, and mutually explanatory, is admitted by every commentator. That the correspondence must be forcible indeed, when it is conceded even by the Unitarians, will readily be granted. For, to put upon the passage in Philippians, such a construction, as will withdraw it from the support of Christ's divinity, is a task, that puzzles even those critics, who make little of the "natural signification of words:" and, therefore, it must be allowed to be rather a dangerous connexion for this text in 2 Corinthians, which they affect to say, when taken by itself, they can so easily get rid of. Yet *Mr. Wakefield*, in his *Inquiry*, (pp. 180, 181. 183,) insists largely upon "the exact correspondence" of the two passages; and contends, that they best "contribute to illustrate each other." *Mr. Belsham*, (*Calm Inquiry*, p. 139. *Letters on Arian.* p. 132, &c.,) the *Editors* also, (*Imp. Vers.* p. 455,) and the other Unitarian writers connect them in like manner. It is to be observed, however, that in their mode of managing this, they conceive that they help their cause: the course, which they pursue, being that of referring the passage of Philippians to that of 2 Corinthians: and thereby, as they imagine, reducing the stronger to the standard of the weaker. But they forget the principle of reaction: and, in their trepida-

exactly parallel to this, he has interpreted the verb for us by its equivalent, ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, [Philipp. ii. 7,] *he emptied him-*

tion, (which, indeed, the text in Philippians ii. 6, &c., may well be supposed to occasion to a Unitarian,) they altogether overlook the circumstance, that if the passage in Philippians is to be explained by that of 2 Corinthians, the passage of 2 Corinthians is also to be explained by that of Philippians. Well, then, the matter is admitted on all hands, that from Philippians ii. 5, 6, we have the best illustration of the passage before us; and, consequently, that by πλούσιος ὤν ἐπτώχευσε, is to be understood the same, as ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε. And thus it appears from *St. Paul's* self-explanation, that the RICHES of Christ were his *divine nature and supreme dominion over all things;* and that his POVERTY consisted in the *divesting himself* of that exalted character and *humbling himself* to the low condition in which he appeared in this world. And, agreeably to this very form of words, in which *St. Paul* has thus explained himself in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, the *Corinthians* are again addressed by *St. Paul's* fellow-labourer *Clement*, in his Epistle to *them*, ch. xvi.—Τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζονείας, οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίτιῤ δυνάμενος· ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρόνων [agreeing with the ταπεινοφροσύνη and ἐταπείνωσεν of the Apostle,] κ. τ. λ. "The Sceptre of the Majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of pride and pre-eminence, although he might have done so; but in humility," &c. It deserves to be noted that *Jerome* here reads καίτιῤ πάντα δυνάμενος; which reading, *Russel* (after *Burton*) maintains to be the true one: —*although possessing all power.* See *Russel, Patr. Apost.* i. 65. Thus, in every view we can take of the passage in question, we find the *change of condition* clearly and distinctly expressed; the *descent* of our Lord from a *superior* to an *inferior* state:—and thus, every reference by which the Unitarian hopes to relieve himself from his difficulties, only tends to make the matter worse.

It should be observed, that even *Grotius*, whom the *Editors* conceive to be an auxiliary to their cause, in their rendering of the text in 2 Corinthians, has supplied some criticisms, which are not altogether favourable to their translation. On Philipp. ii. 7, he says—"ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε. [Plane idem sensus qui 2 Cor. viii. 9, ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσε, πλούσιος ὤν. Nam *inopes* dicuntur *κένοι*," &c. —"ἐταπείνωσε ἑαυτόν]" —"sicut ἐκένωσε, ita ἐταπείνωσε formæ sunt Hiphil, sed significant talem se exhibere aut ostendere." Here is an admission, though a reluctant one, that ἐπτώχευσε signifies a *change of state;* inasmuch as it is pronounced to be precisely equivalent to ἐκένωσε, which is admitted to be of the form of Hiphil, which indicates that change. This indeed he attempts to do away by what follows. But his criticism stands in opposition to his theology; and is itself sound, whatever may become of the latter.—In truth, it is well known, that *Grotius's* comment upon this part of Scripture is condemned by every body. Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, he understands, as signifying Christ's being made like our first parents, in a state of innocence: than which, as *Dr. Clarke* observes, "nothing can be more unnatural."

It should be recollected, that *Grotius's* Annotations on the *Epistles* were not published till after his death:—so that, even though we could be sure, that they were fairly published, there is reason to conceive that they contain many things undigested, and many that he might have altered had he lived to send the work to the press himself. See *Hammond* on the title of 2 Peter, and *J. Berriman's Moyer's Lecture*, p. 329. Yet the authority of this unfinished and unauthenticated work, is what the Unita-

self? Emptied himself of his former riches and glory,—that glory which he had with the Father before the world began. No two passages in any writer can be conceived more pointedly to correspond, or to be more happily illustrative of each other, than these two passages of St. Paul. In both, our Saviour is presented as an example, in having voluntarily descended from a state of greatness to one of humiliation: and the object being to recommend liberality in the one case, and humility joined with brotherly love in the other, the Apostle describes the example, which our Lord had exhibited, in the terms appropriate to the respective subjects: *riches* and *poverty* being spoken of in the former, as *greatness* and *abasement* are in the latter; and as again we find the *ignominy of the cross* the topic selected in a third, where our Lord's example is pointed out as recommending to his followers *patience under sufferings*. [See *Rosenm.* on 2 Cor. viii. 9. "Selegit Apostolus *paupertatis* specimen, quoniam hic de *pauperibus* et *liberalitate* sermo est. Sic Hebr. xii. 2, ponitur *ignominia*, &c.] Thus, then, we have, at once, the phrase πλούσιος ὢν, explained to us by the words ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων; and ἐπτώχευσε by its corresponding ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε; and St. Paul, in this clear and emphatical manner, becomes a Commentator upon himself.

But, in truth, St. Paul may be said to have become such within the very limits of the passage before us; having pointed out, by the marked antithesis between its two corresponding clauses, that the one part may justly be taken as the interpreter of the other. Now, that the verb in the second clause implies a change of condition, is placed beyond all question. The force of the verb πλουτέω[a], as well as the

rians prefer to most others. It might be worth while to inquire, through what hands this posthumous publication passed to the press.

[a] The *Syriac* Interpreters most unequivocally inform us, in what sense they conceived the word πλουτίω to be here used by the Apostle. They have rendered it by ܬܬܥܫܪ *ditesceretis*, "that you might *become rich*:" from the verb ܥܫܪ which has no other signification than *ditescere, ditatus, dives factus, locupletatus est*, i. e. *to be enriched*, or *become rich*. In this sense only is the *Syriac* word used, wherever it occurs

very nature of the subject, unequivocally evinces the Apostle's meaning to be, that, *by* the poverty of Christ, they, to whom

throughout the N. T.—And this, it is to be observed, is the very word employed in the *Syriac* rendering of 1 Cor. i. 5, in which the Greek is ἐπλουτίσθητε; and in which St. Paul is distinctly engaged in informing the Corinthians, in what they had *been enriched* by Jesus Christ.—Again, if we go to the *Greek* translators of the Old Testament, we shall find the same to be the almost invariable use of the verb πλουτίω with *them*. For this I refer the reader to Gen. xxx. 44; Ps. xlix. 16; Prov. xxviii. 22, (20 in some copies of the Greek,) Jerem. v. 27; Hos. xii. 8; Zech. xi. 5; for the use of the word by the LXX:—to Prov. xxi. 17, for the use of it by *Symm.* and *Theod.*; and to Prov. xxi. 17; xxiii. 4, for the use of it by *Aquila*. In all these passages, the verb πλουτίω is used, in a sense expressive of the *acquisition* of riches, or *becoming* rich: and in all of them, but two, (Gen. xxx. 44; Prov. xxviii. 22,) it is used as the translation of the *Hebrew* word עשר, which is the same with the *Syriac* ܥܫܪ employed to render the word πλουτίω in the very passage before us. There are also two places in the Apocrypha, Judith xv. 7, and Sirac. xi. 17, in which the verb πλουτίω occurs in the same sense: and there is scarcely a single passage in the Greek of the O. T. in which it is found in any other. See *Schindler*, also, for the use of the *Chaldee* עתר, (the same as the Syriac ܥܫܪ,) in the like sense everywhere. (See pp. 164, 165.) Jerome, likewise, has rendered the original word corresponding to πλουτίω in every one of the above passages, in the sense of *ditari, dives factus sum*. We, therefore, can, upon the whole, entertain no doubt, as to the prevalent meaning of the verb πλουτίω in the Greek of the Old Testament. But independently of the aid derived from this, we can have as little doubt of the use of it in the New: it being in every passage, besides the one in question, throughout the New Testament, wherever it occurs in its simply *verbal* state, employed in the same sense of *becoming*, or *being made* rich. See 1 Cor. iv. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 9. 18; Apoc. iii. 17, 18; xviii. 3. 15. 19; in all of which, not only does the context clearly demand this sense, but we find it actually assigned in *Jerome's* translation. See *Schleusner* on the word. *Stephanus*, in translating the σοσὸν ἐπλουτήσας of *Nazianzen*, renders "dives *factus sis*." That the Lexicons generally explain the word by *dives sum*, as well as by *ditesco*; and that the word, in its general application, signifies *to be*, as well as to *become rich*,—there can be no question. At the same time it should be observed, that the significations assigned to the word by *Constantine*, in his *Lexicon*, are "*ditari, locupletari, dives evado, dives sum:*" so that, in the judgment of this writer, it should seem, that the more frequent acceptation of the word is to *become rich*. But, whether this be so or not, we have seen from numerous instances, that the prevalent use of the word in *Scripture* Greek, is in this acceptation undoubtedly: and that it should be so in the New Testament especially, in its figurative application to Christian acquisitions, is most natural; since the whole language of the Gospel bespeaks a *change of human condition*, wrought by our Lord's appearance amongst men. In the verse before us, this meaning of the word is decidedly marked, among other considerations, from its connexion through the 7th verse with 1 Cor. i. 5, in which, as already noticed, the verb ἐπλουτίσθητε expresses the *change of condition*, beyond the possibility of cavil. Indeed on this sense of the verb, here, all commentators seem agreed.

he addressed himself, were *enriched*. Two contemporary states cannot here be pretended. It would be absurd to say, that it is meant, that *while*, or *during the time that*, our Lord *was poor*, they *continued rich*. It must be, and it is, admitted, that to be *enriched*, or *made rich*, is what is here expressed: and that *by* that state, in which our Lord was placed, and which is denominated *poverty*, they were placed in that state which is denominated *rich*. They were brought, then, into that state, from one that differed from it: they were brought into a state of riches, from a state of poverty. The transition, therefore, *from poverty to riches*, being distinctly conveyed in the latter clause; that *from riches to poverty*, is as clearly marked in the former. *Dr. Wardlaw*, whose services in the cause of Christian truth are highly valuable, thus justly represents it. "A transition is expressed on the part of Jesus; a *voluntary transition*, from a state of infinite glory and riches, to a state of debasement and poverty; in order to a transition on the part of his people, from a state of wretched degradation and poverty, to the possession of true honour and of excellent and durable riches." (*Discourses*, &c., pp. 159, 160.)

Here, then, is the true, and natural, and satisfactory, view of the passage before us. The Apostle, being desirous to excite the liberal feelings of the Corinthians towards their needy brethren, and to do this upon principles worthy of the followers of Christ, naturally places before them the example of the divine benevolence of their heavenly Master. "If Christ emptied himself of his heavenly abundance and glory, to supply your spiritual wants, and make you rich in that which is the true riches; will not you part even with some of your worldly wealth, to supply the temporal wants of your poor and afflicted brethren?—'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich.'" I have here adopted that translation of the English Bible which was superseded by the Version in pre-

sent use [a], as giving more accurately the force of the original, which, indeed, it will be found upon examination to do upon many other passages.

Should any objection be made, here, to the use of the word "THOUGH," as not being expressly marked in the original; at the same time that this objection must be ascribed to the influence of theological prepossession, rather than of Greek criticism; yet, to remove every scruple, be it admitted that the literal translation, *Being rich*, should be adhered to. What advantage do Unitarian critics expect to derive from this? It is manifest, that, although they commend this simple rendering of the participle, they conceive it not altogether safe to rest upon it. Laudatur et alget. *Though he was rich*, is a wrong rendering, say *Mr. Wakefield*, *Mr. Belsham*, &c., the words are strictly, BEING *rich:* and therefore we will render them—what? not BEING *rich*, but, WHILE *he was rich*. This, however, will not do. The thrusting out "THOUGH," on the pretence, that BEING *rich* is the true translation; and then slipping in "WHILE" in place of it, is but a clumsy sort of legerdemain. No, let us abide by something steadily: and let us suppose with the Unitarians, that, BEING *rich*, is the just translation. What follows from this? Simply, that *at the time when* our Lord made himself poor, he *was* rich: so that, as we have already remarked at pp. 184—186, "a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty" seems to be as strongly expressed, as it is by the form of the present Received Version.

But, if it be attempted still to insist (in opposition to the well-known usage of the language) upon the impropriety of applying the word ὢν to *past* time, and to contend for its necessary application in the case before us to *continued being;* let the Unitarian take the full advantage of the still closer

[a] The old rendering by *Wiclif* is perhaps not inferior to any—And ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, for he was made needy for you when he was rich, that ye should be made rich by his neediness—"and ghe witen the grace of oure Lord Issus Crist, for he was maad nedi for ghou whanne he was riche, that ghe schulden be maad riche bi his nedynesse."

approximation of this text to that of Philippians, by the more perfect agreement of *ΩΝ with the force of ΥΠΑΡΧΩΝ, and the more emphatical designation of the *nature* and *subsistence* of Christ[a]; namely, that, *being in his nature* rich, he became poor, &c. If these new light expositors will have the matter thus, it cannot be helped. The other parts of the sentence they cannot possibly shake. They may add strength by this buttress, if they will.

I shall now lay before the reader a note upon the passage, extracted from one of those Commentators, to whom the Unitarians are sometimes desirous to appeal. *Rosenmüller* says, on this 9th verse of 2 Cor.—"*Quod quum esset rerum omnium Dominus ditissimus*, i. e. beatitate abundantissimus, *tamen propter vos in maxima paupertate vixit* in his terris, *ut ejus paupertate divites fieretis*, i. e. etsi poterat esse beatissimus, quippe filius Dei, tamen multas calamitates pertulit, ut felices fieretis, et omnibus bonis cumularemini. In verbis πλούσιος ὢν ponitur species felicitatis, intelligitur autem omnis felicitas. Non enim Christus ullo tempore fuit dives, ut nos divites pecuniis dicimur.—*Fuit autem beatitate abundantissimus priusquam in has terras adspectabilis venit.* Sic etiam *paupertate* Christi omnis ejus humilitas et vita ærumnarum plena est intelligenda. Hæc enim, Deo ita volente, salutis nostræ causa facta est."—*Schleusner* is another authority, to whom these writers frequently pretend to refer. How does *he* explain this passage?—"ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσε, πλούσιος ὢν, *qui vestrûm causa pauper* FACTUS EST, cum TAMEN esset ipsi facultas rebus omnibus pro arbitrio utendi, rerumque omnium dominium; seu, cum TAMEN esset felicissimus et beatissimus. *Intelligitur autem ibi δόξα illa, quam*

[a] *Dr. Middleton* says, "I know not, indeed, whether ὑπάρχων may not be rendered PRE-EXISTING; for *Suidas*, edit. Kust. vol. iii. p. 532, observes, τὸ ὑπάρχειν οὐκ ἁπλῶς τὸ εἶναι σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ τὸ πάλαι εἶναι, καὶ ΠΡΟΕΙΝΑΙ φάσκειν."—*Doct. of the Greek Art.* pp. 538, 539.—*Diodati*, in his admirable translation, uses the same word *essendo*, both for ὢν and for ὑπάρχων. He, like other commentators, refers 2 Cor. viii. 9, to Phil. ii. 6, &c., for fuller explanation: and in his illustration of *essendo in forma di Dio*, &c., in the latter, he says, "possedeva quella gloria divina, *come sua propria di natura*, essendo uguale in ogni cosa al Padre in verità, e di ragione eterna."

Christus AB ÆTERNO *habuisse apud Deum* DISERTE IN N. T. TRADITUR"—"ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ πλουτήσητε, ut vos ejus paupertate et humili statu et conditione *redderemini* participes felicitatis Christianorum."[a]

Thus, we see, that, as to the passage before us, we have every circumstance, that can determine a mind capable of forming a sound judgment, in favour of the sense which has been ascribed to it in our common Version: the meaning of the words, the force of the context, the turn of the reasoning, the comment supplied by a parallel passage of the same writer, the authority of the Versions, the judgment of the ablest critics. We have all. But then this sense lets in the PRE-EXISTENCE of Christ: and, therefore, it *cannot* be the true one. Make what havoc you will, of language, and context, and reasoning, and authorities, the thing *cannot be*. Another sense must be devised: and another translation, though it be such as was never heard or thought of for near 1800 years, must be contrived, so as to exclude the obnoxious meaning; and to satisfy *Mr. Belsham's* man of "sound understanding and honest mind," (who, not inconveniently, may be destitute of all information upon these subjects,) that the true interpretation of the Apostle, is such as would *equally prove the pre-existence of every person who was a miser*, as that of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 122.)

But now, the absurd notion of our Lord's pre-existence

[a] *Locke* has given no explanatory note, but he has rendered the passage in a manner, that supports the received Version decidedly against the Unitarian reading—"who, being rich, *made himself* poor for your sake, that you, by his poverty, might *become* rich."—It is manifest, that the Editors receive but little countenance in any quarter, for their novel and inconsistent interpretation of the text. Perhaps there is no more satisfactory explanation given of the several parts of the verse than that which has been given by *Diodati*.—"*Rich*,] in the possession of a perfect happiness and glory in his divine nature. *He became*,] he hath taken upon him our nature with all the miseries, wants, and obligations, Phil. ii. 7, to gain for you the treasures of God's grace, righteousness and eternal life." And agreeable to this is his accurate translation—"che voi conosciate la gratia del Signor nostro Jesu Christo; *cioè*, ch' egli, essendo ricco, s' è fatto pouero per voi; accioche voi arrichiste per la sua pouertà."

being completely shut out by this newly-discovered version of the passage, how is the real meaning and application to be rendered intelligible, to the "sound understanding and honest mind" of this unbiassed and uninformed arbiter of Scripture truth?—"Ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that while he was rich, yet for your sakes he lived in poverty, that through his poverty ye might be rich."—Rich in what? "RICH in miraculous powers, which he *could employ if he pleased to* HIS OWN ADVANTAGE. But for the benefit of his followers he chose to lead a life of POVERTY AND INDIGENCE," &c. (*Imp. Vers.* p. 416.) We see then that the *riches* of our Lord consisted in his *power of having riches*, by which he might have secured himself against *poverty*, and have lived a *rich man*, richer even than the richest of the Corinthians. And this the Editors follow up, by remarking, that "this was a very proper example to the Corinthians, which they might feel and imitate." Undoubtedly it was.—Our Saviour gave up *his riches*, (RICHES, it appears here, in the *literal sense*,) and, therefore, the Corinthians ought to give up *theirs*. The example goes farther. Our Lord gave up his riches for the benefit of others: the Corinthians were now to do the same.

This is all correct and natural. *Riches* are literally spoken of throughout the entire passage, and the example consequently becomes much "more pertinent and applicable than a supposed descent from a prior state of existence and felicity, to which there could be nothing analogous in the case of the Corinthians:" the Corinthians not having on their part descended from any such state. Still, however, one difficulty, I fear, must hang upon the mind of the man of "sound understanding:" for, we have hitherto entirely forgotten (after the example of the Editors) one important clause of the sentence: we have forgotten to explain how it was, that *through our Lord's poverty the Corinthians were to be rich*. Were they to gain the riches which our Lord declined to use? Or how were they to be rendered wealthy by his poverty? According to the interpretation of the *Editors*,

the *riches*, which they *derived* from our *Lord's poverty*, they were called on to impart to their indigent brethren, so as to diminish the evils of *their poverty*. The whole is quite intelligible,—if, indeed, the Editors would be but kind enough to add the one trifling circumstance of explanation, to which we have alluded; namely, in what manner our Saviour's want of riches swelled the coffers of the Corinthians. Here, however, *Mr. Belsham* supplies the deficiency of his brother Editors. He informs his man of "sound understanding," that, although *riches* were spoken of *literally*[a], in the *first*

[a] This writer has not actually used the word "*literal*" as applied to *riches* in this clause, but the whole train of his reasoning pronounces the word for him. —*Dr. Carpenter* speaks of the expression as "*almost literal.*" ALMOST LITERAL! Does he mean by this, something that is neither figurative nor literal? Perhaps it may bear explanation. The truth is, the matter is rather puzzling to the Unitarian commentator. He knows not well what to make of this clause. He cannot say, in strictness, that the word "*rich*" is *literally* employed here, and he is unwilling to admit expressly that it is *figurative*. The thing is, accordingly, huddled up, in such a way, as to leave on the mind of the reader the general impression of a literal application, although it is not actually asserted. This sort of application is, I suppose, what *Dr. Carpenter* intends, when he speaks of it as "*almost literal.*" (*Unit. the Doct.*, &c., p. 232.) And I have, accordingly, spoken of the application of the word by the Unitarian writers as *literal*, because their argument requires that they should be so understood. But the truth is, that their *real* application of the word "*rich*" in the first clause, (let them call it *almost literal*, or what they will,) is decidedly *figurative*. "*Rich in miracles*" (even though such miracles alone were here intended as might create *literal riches*) is still to be *figuratively* "rich." And, consequently, the Unitarian version of this passage is fairly exposed to the following judicious animadversion. "The plain reader—even admitting him to think with the Unitarian Editor, that our Lord was rich and poor *at the same time*,—still would conclude, that the adjectives *rich* and *poor* were applied to our Saviour's condition in a sense directly and literally *opposite* to each other. This passage then, taken in this obvious sense, would clearly point out to him the twofold character of the person to whom it referred, as the *Son of God*, the Creator and great Proprietor of all things; and the *Son of Man*, 'as having nowhere to lay his head.' For certainly it would not occur to the plain reader, that the Apostle meant to describe our Saviour as at the same time *rich in miracles*, and *poor in condition*; for this would be to make the Apostle, without any apparent reason, write *figuratively* and *literally* of the same person in the same sentence; an incongruous mode of writing, calculated to lead into error." See page 55 of the *Archdeacon of Sarum's Charge*, June 1815:—a publication, containing, in addition to much valuable matter on other subjects, some remarks of distinguished judgment and force on the Unitarian method of interpreting the Scriptures.—To what has been here so justly observed in this passage, much need not be added. It may be sufficient to say, that not only would it never occur to any plain and

clause, with respect to our Lord; (and properly so, because riches and the imparting of them form the entire subject of the Apostle's address;) yet they were not intended literally, in the *second* clause, with respect to the Corinthians. We are told by *Mr. Belsham*, here, of what "the connexion requires." We now find, that, although hitherto we ought naturally to use the word *rich* in a *literal* sense; we shall *here* fall into downright absurdity, unless we drop that sense of the word immediately. *Mr. Belsham* informs us, that in this place the word should "be taken in a *figurative* sense: rich in faith, in holiness, in benevolence, and in the promises and blessings of the Gospel:"—in every thing, in short, but what he and his brother Editors had hitherto contended must be signified by the word.

But here, *Mr. Belsham's* man of "sound understanding" may possibly recollect, that he had been assured by the *Calm Inquirer*, and his brother Editors, again and again, that literal and figurative acceptations of the same word are not to be admitted in the same sentence; that "good writers do not in grave discourse capriciously change the meaning of words," &c.; and that, upon this very principle of interpretation, he had been already pressed by *Mr. B.* and the *Editors*, to part with many texts, in which the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence seemed to be clearly expressed. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 50, &c., also pp. 155—157, of this volume.) But, then, it is manifest, that, unless this canon be relinquished in *this* place, the whole of this new translation of the sentence would become unintelligible, and must consequently be given up; and then the doctrine of the *pre-existence* necessarily comes

unsophisticated understanding, that "*rich*" and "*poor*" were in this clause applied to our Lord in reference to *different* subjects, or that they were not directly and literally *opposed* to each other; but it is manifest, that it would never occur to such an understanding, that *miracles*, which are never once mentioned or alluded to in the most remote degree, could have been intended here under the word "*rich*." In truth, a new revelation would be requisite, to satisfy any man of "sound understanding," that such was the reference of the expression. And yet, it is to a person of this description, that the Unitarian critics profess their willingness here and elsewhere to appeal.

in; which, the man of "sound understanding" *must* know, *cannot* be true. Well, then; the word, of course, *must* be figurative in this clause. How goes on the explanation now? How could our Saviour's want of *literal* wealth make his followers *figuratively* rich? How was the circumstance of our Lord's being *poor*, to make them *holy?* This again puts the man of "sound understanding" to a stand.

But here, also, there is a ready explanation for him. It was not the mere poverty, but the voluntary submission to that poverty; the example of fortitude and self-denial, in relinquishing the riches which he enjoyed (potentially) in his miraculous powers. He possessed the power of working miracles at his pleasure, he had, as *Mr. Lindsey* and *Mr. Belsham* express it, "all nature at his command, and could supply every want." (*Calm Inq.* p. 126.) How is this? replies the man of "sound understanding." You have said elsewhere (p. 447), that Christ "was a *man*, constituted in *all respects* like *other men*, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties:" and yet you now say, that he had "all nature at his command." But so far from having "all nature at his command," has not Dr. Priestley, one of your greatest luminaries, already satisfied all "RATIONAL CHRISTIANS" of "sound understanding," that the power of working miracles was not inherent in our Lord; that he merely "spoke the word, or used some indifferent action, (such as anointing the eyes of the blind man,) and God produced the effect;" that, in the supposed working of the miracle by Christ or any other prophet, all that was "necessary as a proof of their divine mission," was, that they "should be able to foretell what God would do, (which, in fact, is all they pretended to,)" and that, in truth, Christ, no more than any other of the prophets, had the smallest power, of himself, to work any miracle?

In this view of the case, (which, indeed, seems the only consistent one for a Unitarian,) it becomes unavoidable to inquire, how any particular power can be said to have been

given to our Lord, which he did not actually display: or rather, as *Dr. Priestley* would more correctly put it, how he could foretell, that things would be done through him, which, in fact, it did not please God should be done? The "power of feeding the multitude—of causing the miraculous draught of fishes," &c., which God deemed necessary for the proof of his mission, was of course permitted to him. But, if God did not deem the power of "supplying himself and his friends with all the comforts, the conveniencies, and the elegancies of life," (*Calm Inq.* p. 126,) necessary for the proof of our Lord's mission, and, therefore, *did not* bestow upon him this power, of course he could not have had such a power. It follows, then, that he was *not* RICH; he had not the miraculous power of making wealth; he had not, like the "*miser*," his hidden coffers: he was literally *poor*, and could not be otherwise. How, then, did his *poverty* make his followers *holy?* The puzzle still continues. If our Lord had not his miraculous powers inherent in his nature, but was merely enabled to connect some act of his with the miracle wrought by a power not his own; or rather, to declare, beforehand, that such miracle would be wrought; we cannot admit the possibility of any miracle being wrought through his instrumentality, which was not actually so wrought. In this case, we can only know what could be, from what has been.

The consequences from this view of the subject being fatal to the exposition of the passage given us by the *Editors*, the modern race of Unitarians find it necessary to abandon it altogether. *Mr. Belsham* and *Mr. Lindsey* inform us, on the contrary, (as we have already remarked,) that our Lord "had *all nature at his command.*" (*Calm Inq.*[a] p. 126.)

[a] *Mr. Belsham* has, in this same page, described our Lord as, "*rich in miraculous powers, which it was at his option to employ for his own benefit,*"—an assertion, which, we have already seen at p. 209, has likewise been made by the *Editors*. The remarks of a judicious writer, on this passage, contain so much intrinsic value, that I cannot deny the reader the satisfaction of perusing them in his own words.—"*Miraculous powers, which it was at his option to employ for his own benefit!* What a strange supposition is this! A

And *Mr. Belsham* again (at pp. 174, 175, 176) states, that he "possessed a voluntary power of working miracles," with-

prophet of the Most High, with miraculous, that is, with almighty power, at his own disposal, to use, as he may incline, for promoting his own wealth, and honour, and aggrandisement! Divine power transferred to a creature! subjected to the will and pleasure of a *mere man!*"—"Such transference of Divine power, I would, in the first place, remark, is a natural impossibility. The might which effects the miracle, resides in God alone. It never can belong to the creature. And residing, as it must, in God alone, it can never be exerted to gratify the will of a creature, who would pervert it to a selfish purpose, or to any purpose different from that which he is commissioned to accomplish, and for the accomplishment and vindication of which alone, the interposition of the power is pledged. The contrary supposition is pregnant with consequences the most serious and fatal. *It destroys the certainty of the evidence of miracles*, and thus subverts one of the main pillars on which the truth of Christianity rests. For, if miraculous power was entirely a *discretionary* power, lodged in the hands and placed at the will of its possessor, to be used for any purpose he pleased; then, what security have we, that it has, in *every* instance, been used agreeably to the design for which it was bestowed?—*always* in support of truth, and *never* of error?—*always* for the accomplishment of Divine, and *never* of selfish ends? The very expression, that it was '*at his option*' how he should employ this power—at the option of a man like ourselves, subject to the perverting influence of human infirmities and human passions,—supposes the *possibility* of the one, as well as of the other: and thus a miracle, however fully ascertained, ceases to be a *conclusive evidence* of truth, or a certain indication of the Divine will." *Wardlaw's Discourses*, pp. 50, 51.—These admirable reflections, of a sound judgment, and a reasoning mind, present such a view of a *discretionary*, or *optionary* power of working miracles, as must render it impossible for any one, who *really* possesses a "sound understanding," to conceive a mere human being invested with such a power. *Mr. Belsham*, however, (as we see above,) claims such a power for our Lord: and, as to the danger of its being perverted under any circumstances in which our Lord could be placed; *that*, he thinks, was completely guarded against by the discipline which our Lord underwent from THE TEMPTATION. (*Calm Inq.* p. 174.) From this, it appears, our Lord had acquired an *unerring discretion*, which secured the certainty of the exercise of such vast "powers only upon proper occasions."

The *wilderness*, it must be observed, stands, with the modern Socinians, in the place of the *heaven*, into which, according to the old Socinians, our Lord was taken up after his baptism. If we ask, where our Lord received those divine communications, the acquisition of which is (as these critics inform us) what is intended, by his *ascending up to heaven*, we are told, by some of them, it was *in the wilderness;* in which our Lord *fancied* himself transported into Heaven. (*Calm Inq.* p. 42.) If, again, we ask, how our Lord, being supposed a mere man, could be secured against the possible misapplication of those vast miraculous powers, which were entirely and absolutely at his own disposal, we are again sent to the *wilderness;* where, we are informed, as we have just seen, that he was duly disciplined for this purpose by his temptation. (See also *Calm Inq.* p. 449.) It happens very fortunately for the Unitarians, that *the wilderness* presents a considerable portion of unoccupied space, over which they may spread as many as they please of those imagined transactions which the furnishing out of their scheme may

out "being prompted by any divine suggestion:" for, that, had it not been so, there could have been "no room for the

require, without the slightest interference from the Evangelical historians. At the same time, as these critics have objected, in opposition to the old Socinian notion of the ascent of our Lord into heaven after his baptism, that no such event has been recorded by the Evangelists, or appears to have been heard of or believed by early Christians, (see *Calm Inq.* p. 43,) may we not reasonably inquire of *Mr. Belsham* and his associates, in which of the Gospels, or in what writings of early Christians we may find related the circumstance of our Lord's having been *disciplined by his temptations in the wilderness*, so as to prevent him from abusing the miraculous powers with which he was intrusted.

But surely, if, after all, *Mr. Belsham* can no better sustain the idea of an *absolute* and *perfectly optionary* power of working miracles possessed by a mere human being, than by the additional consideration of a certain discipline (in the wilderness) being sufficient to secure *such a being* against the possible abuse of *such a power*, he needed not to have been at the trouble of fabricating such history to support such philosophy. For, even admitting gratuitously to *Mr. Belsham* both the history and the philosophy; admitting that a discipline *was* administered in the wilderness to guard our Lord against a wilful abuse of his miraculous powers, and admitting that such discipline must suffice to secure a mere human being, a creature of passions and infirmities, against the possibility of an intentional misapplication of those powers; what was there to guard against their *erroneous* exercise in a being labouring under the "ignorance and prejudices" of human nature? For how stands the case respecting the *knowledge* of our Lord? *Naturally*, (*Mr. Belsham* informs us,) our Lord was *subject to the very same infirmities, ignorance, and prejudices*, as other men: (*Calm Inq.* p. 447:) and, *supernaturally*, he was instructed only so far "as was necessary for the execution of his commission, that is, for the revelation and proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally with the Jews;"—so that when he has "delivered opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of his mission, such opinions, and his reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and caution with those of other persons in similar circumstances," &c., (pp. 451, 452.) The same writer again informs us, (p. 472,) that "it no more derogates from the authority of Christ, than it does from that of Moses, that his inspiration should not extend beyond the proper objects of his mission, and that in *other cases* he should entertain the *same opinions, and be liable to the same misconceptions, as his countrymen, and those amongst whom he was educated.* These, also, *Mr. Belsham* informs us, are the opinions held and avowed by Unitarians at large. What then follows, on the principles here laid down? Our Lord's *inspiration was restricted*, whilst his *power of working miracles was unlimited.* On *all* subjects *but* those connected with the doctrine of a future life, and the calling in of the Gentiles jointly with the Jews, he was *equally* liable to error and prejudice with other men. But upon *all* subjects, it was in his power to work miracles, in attestation of his truth and of his knowledge. He had the power then of giving divine attestation to human error. And against this misapplication of his miraculous powers even the *discipline of the wilderness* furnishes no security; because *that* discipline is only contended for as in counteraction to *wilful* abuse: but it is of the nature of error to be un-

exercise either of discretion or benevolence." Thus we see that *Dr. Priestley*, who for a certain time was looked up to as THE INFALLIBLE of the English Unitarians, is now given up as having gone too far. He, like a true "RATIONAL CHRISTIAN," had followed his own principles fairly on to their legitimate results. He saw, that, having represented Christ as a mere man, like in all respects to any other man, he could not consistently allow to him the entire dominion over the works of nature, so as to be able, *at his own will and pleasure*, to suspend and alter the laws of the material creation. He, therefore, made our Lord the mere instrument of the divine power, and left nothing of miracles to his own volition. This answered the purpose of Unitarians, so long as they were content to flourish away upon mere *rational principles*, as they called them. But, so soon as their evil genius tempted them to turn expounders of Scripture, they found that this legitimate result of their system was no longer tenable. They found it overwhelmingly contradicted by numerous and decisive texts. And not being prepared to eject these texts altogether as spurious;—having discovered no early heretic, in whose copy of the N. T. they were said to be wanting; nor any German Theologue, who had expressed a conjecture that *possibly* they were not genuine;—they were obliged to abandon *Dr. Priestley*, and their own system, and to contend for a power, possessed by a mere ordinary human being, not inferior to that which belongs to the great Author of nature himself—the power of suspending and altering the laws of nature.

In truth, it seems most unaccountable, how a *Unitarian* could be led to so momentous an admission, as that our Lord "HAD ALL NATURE AT HIS COMMAND." It will be difficult for him, under such an admission, to escape from the monstrous absurdity, which he charges upon the *Arian*, of *a Greater*

conscious of itself. Thus the Unitarian philosophy, by its separation of knowledge from power, would subvert the evidence of miracles, and enlist even Omnipotence itself in the possible support of falsehood.

God and a Lesser: an absurdity, on which he contrives to fasten others not inferior, of his own manufacture; one of which is, that the lesser God was to exercise his universal dominion over nature, was to possess his omnipotence, but for a limited and short portion of time; not much more than the space of one year, if we are to take *Mr. Belsham's* account of our Lord's ministry. (*Calm Inq.* p. 449.) And, what makes the whole of this extraordinary admission of the Unitarian the more extraordinary, is, that it is intended for the purpose of *diminishing* the rank of that Being, to whom such vast and divine power is ascribed: the admission of this power, being, in some cases, the only means, whereby the language of Scripture, announcing the *pre-existence* of our Lord, can possibly be evaded. And thus, for the purpose of proving, that *pre-existence* is not to be attributed to our Lord, and for the further purpose of thence inferring that he was *not more than man*, they contend for his possessing that which makes him *not less than God:* they contend also, for his possessing this, under circumstances, which might permit him to give the stamp of *divine attestation* to *human error.*

Upon the whole, I fear that the man of "sound understanding" will find himself most sadly bewildered by the *clear and satisfactory* explanations of Unitarian critics; and that he will ultimately be led to suspect, that they are creating more mysteries[a] in the world of reason, than the most determined orthodox had ever contended for in the world of grace.

Although the remarks upon the Unitarian treatment of this text have already run to a length far beyond what to many

[a] *Dr. Young* has truly pronounced of the *Socinians*, that they "have been most unfortunate in the execution of their main design: for" (he adds) "they have not purged MYSTERY out of the Scripture, they have only changed its place; they have taken mystery out of the *doctrine* of Scripture, where it was venerable, and worthy of the majesty of God, and have placed it in the *phrase* of Scripture, where it is opprobrious and repugnant to God's sincerity." (Sermons, vol. ii. p. 78.)—In truth, the Socinians seem, at all times, to have had a pleasure in making *mysteries*, in whatever is in its own nature *unmysterious*, such as *reason* and *language;* but, in that, which *must be mysterious* to man, as being placed beyond his comprehension, namely the DIVINE NATURE, they will not allow *any mystery*, not even on the testimony of God himself.

may appear requisite; yet I cannot refuse a word or two to the same subject, as connected with the Unitarian exposition of the corresponding passage in Philipp. ii. 6. "*Being in the form of God*," is there represented, as "*being rich*," was here, the "being invested with miraculous power;" (*I. V.* and *Calm Inq.* p. 143;) and ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε in that place is, like ἐπτώχευσε in this, the "divesting himself of" that form of God, i. e. *of those miraculous powers*, in which that *form* consisted. (Ibid.) That is, say the *I. V.* and *Mr. Belsham*, Christ "did not absolutely relinquish his miraculous powers, but submitted to indignity and crucifixion, *as though* he were destitute of power to help himself:" or, as Mr. B. states it, "when the purposes of his mission required it, he conducted himself *as though* he were totally destitute of all supernatural gifts." These writers, it is to be observed, have been most careful to inform us, that the expression in this text is extremely strong—he "EMPTIED *himself*"—"he EXHAUSTED *himself, parted with all without retaining any thing*"—"he DIVESTED *himself of* EVERY THING *that is intended by the form and likeness of God*." (See *Calm Inq.* pp. 138, 139.) But, at the same time, we are taught to recollect, that our Lord did not *absolutely relinquish*, that of which he had thus *totally* EMPTIED, and EXHAUSTED, and DIVESTED *himself*. The man of "sound understanding" is informed, that, although the Apostle has declared, that our Lord had divested himself of certain powers, he only appeared *as though* he had done so; but that, in reality, he had *not* divested himself of any, but possessed them secretly all the while: just as before, he seemed *as though* he was poor, at the very time when he possessed an unknown hoard of riches. Thus our Lord most miraculously appears to have been *really invested with*, and *really divested of*, the *same* powers, at *one and the same* moment of time. "WHILE *he was poor he was rich*," both *I. V.* and *Mr. Belsham* chant forth here again as clearing up all. (*I. V.* p. 455. *Calm Inq.* p. 139.)

Moreover, these critics take prodigious pains to satisfy us, that this "*form of God*" had nothing to do with an *internal*

nature or essence; but simply consisted in an *external appearance*, a *resemblance*. This resemblance, also, they apprize us, consisted in the exercise of miraculous powers. What then follows? Our Lord in not exercising those miraculous powers, divested himself of that resemblance; but at the same time CONTINUING *in the form of God*, he still retained that resemblance: so that, during the time in which he continued to bear a resemblance to God, he was all along destitute of any such resemblance Μορφὴ *the form*, signifies, only *quod in oculos incurrit, an appearance to the sight*:—this *Mr. Belsham* adopts from Grotius and others; and enlarges upon it, (*Calm Inq.* p. 132,) and, then, we are told by him and his brother Editors, that the true construction of the passage in Philippians is, that *this appearance was to continue, whilst nothing appeared.* —This, again, is prepared for the man of "sound understanding" to swallow as he can. On this text *Mr. Belsham* has expended seventeen close and heavy pages: and, after great labour both of Metaphysics and Philology, (*such* Metaphysics and *such* Philology as fall to the lot of a *certain* tribe of writers,) he has brought the whole matter to this single point.

On the text itself, it will be observed, I have offered no remark tending to enforce its true interpretation. This, had it even fallen within my plan, would have been altogether superfluous. The ample consideration bestowed upon this important passage, by Commentators of the greatest ability and learning, has long ago placed it beyond the reach of Socinian criticism; and has established, on such grounds as cannot be shaken, its direct announcement of the *pre-existence* and *divinity* of our Lord: and, as for the absurd attempts of *modern* Unitarians to disturb the true application of the text, these have been so recently and so ably exposed by *Dr. Nares* and *Bishop Burgess*, (to whom no reply has yet been attempted,) that any further observation upon them must be useless. Simply to state the result of their own exposition and their own arguments, I have deemed sufficient for their refutation. This, indeed, will be found, generally, to be the case, with respect to these Critics. And, in truth,

with regard to the text before us especially, were it desired to confirm any one, who had doubts as to its genuine import, a better plan could not be devised, than to induce him (if he really were a person of "sound understanding") to peruse the Unitarian arguments against it, especially as they are detailed by *Mr. Belsham;* who winds up the most incoherent and self-contradictory jumble, that ever passed under the name of criticism, with an assertion, (which, surely, can be viewed in no other light than as a jocular experiment upon his reader,)—that THIS "is one of those passages, of which *no use can be made* in deciding the controversy," concerning the divinity of Christ. *Literæ non erubescunt*, is an old saying. There are things which a man may write, which he could not easily command countenance to say.

The reader, however, will not fail to recollect, that this is one of the most important passages, throughout the New Testament, on the question of our Lord's *divinity*. He will not fail to recollect also, that the text in 2 Corinthians, which forms the subject of the present Number, is, by universal consent, identified with this passage in its import; and that the fate of each is, particularly by the Unitarians, conceived to be involved in that of the other. And he will, above all, not fail to recollect, that, in á text of such unquestionable moment in the controversy with the Unitarians, the *Editors* of the *Imp. Vers.* have departed from *Archbishop Newcome's* translation, in a laboured form of phrase, which, as they think, (and struggle at much length to prove,) *excludes the idea of pre-existence;* and that, of this departure, they have not thought it necessary to give the slightest notice.

We come now to Number VI., in which we find not only a total departure from the *Primate's* translation, but an actual fabrication of Scripture. For the comparison of the two versions, I refer the reader to page 116 of this volume. The first clause in the *Imp. Vers.* is, as we have there quoted, "See that ye refuse not *God* who speaketh;" whilst the *Primate* renders it, "See that ye refuse not him who speaketh." The Greek is, Βλέπετε, μὴ παραιτήσησθε

τὸν λαλοῦντα. Now, the first thing to be observed here is, that, neither in *Newcome's* translation, nor in the Greek, does the word "GOD" occur. *Griesbach* does not notice a single MS. or Version that contains the word "GOD," or that makes the slightest alteration in the Greek text here given, with the unimportant exception of the addition of the word ὑμῖν after λαλοῦντα in one or two MSS. and Versions. *Griesbach* and *Newcome* are the two great standards, to which the *Editors profess* to adhere. Yet here they depart from both: and arbitrarily introduce the word "GOD;" which is not only not to be found in either, but which is not even pretended to have place, in any one of the MSS. Versions, or Fathers, known to be in existence. Τὸν λαλοῦντα, (simply *him that speaketh*; "*loquentem*," *as the Vulgate* has it; or, as old *Wiclif*, "*the speker*,") is the only reading of the passage. So that, here, there is a direct *fabrication* of the word "GOD," and a gross imposition upon the reader.

To say, that the word has been introduced because the Unitarians conceive *God* to have been intended as *the speaker*, is merely to say, that, whatever Unitarians choose to consider as the meaning, should be substituted for the language, and introduced into the text, of Scripture: in a word, that the comment of the lowest and most illiterate order of Socinians, shall be taken as forming a part of the original of the New Testament. This transcends Popery itself. The *Council of Trent* only decreed, that the Comment, imposed by the *Church of Rome*, should be received, as giving the *meaning* of Scripture. But the *Council of Essex Street* ordains that the Comment, imposed by the *Church which denies Christ*, shall be received as *part* of Scripture itself.—That the word is printed in Italics, is but a poor evasion. The common and uninformed reader, on whom alone these writers can hope to produce an effect; the *unlearned* man "of sound understanding," whom they select as the proper arbiter of *their* criticisms; but little attends to, and is for the most part ignorant of this distinction. And that these Unitarian Editors *designed*, by the introduction of

this word into the text, something more than the mere declaration of *their opinion*, that it was *God* who was intended, is evident; because the whole of this purpose would have been completely answered by the statement of that opinion in the Note. Let it for a moment be supposed, that the *Received Version*, instead of reading, "him who speaketh," had substituted "*Christ in his divine nature*" for the word "him;" would the Unitarians conceive, that King James's translators had dealt fairly with the public? Would they not, on the contrary, clamour loudly against this, as a dishonest attempt to impose the Trinitarian comments as the text of Scripture? Would there be any end to the outcry, which on this ground would be raised against "*interested priests;*"—against "men *engaged* to defend an established system"—"the profession of which is *paid for* out of the public purse,"—and "who are, from that very circumstance, *engaged to discourage enquiry and to oppose truth:* and to whom, as we are told, TRUTH MUST NECESSARILY BE THE OBJECT OF AVERSION AND ABHORRENCE?" Yet this, which would be so heinous in a Trinitarian Clergy, is precisely what has been done by their Socinian opponents and calumniators; who have (vainly) endeavoured to exclude the idea of Christ, by the unwarrantable introduction of the word "*God*" into the text.

When they subjoin in a note, that it is "*evident* that God is the speaker intended;" it may fairly be asked, why then they did not trust the passage to this *evidence?* If the reader *must* have understood GOD, by "him that speaketh;" why not leave the text in its *true* state to announce its own *indubitable* meaning? Why *fabricate* a text, to sustain a truth, that must of itself *manifestly* shine forth? The reader will easily supply the answer. The fact is, they plainly saw, that the text, *as it stands*, must unavoidably lead the mind to CHRIST, as the *speaker*. They saw more: they saw, that it not only introduces CHRIST, as the speaker *now;* but as the speaker *before*, both in GIVING THE LAW, and in UTTERING ORACLES THROUGH THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD DISPENSATION.

They saw, in truth, that not only the *pre-existence*, but the *divinity* of CHRIST, was obviously deducible from this passage; and that thus, although GOD indeed was spoken of, it was in a sense directly opposite to theirs, being GOD IN CHRIST: and therefore, they, very prudently, and with the *wisdom* belonging to *their generation*, have made the *requisite* alteration in the text[a]. Thus it is, that the Unitarian,

[a] We see how this passage in Hebrews is disposed of.—*Christ* is not here specifically named. His being clearly pointed out in the context, signifies nothing. His being *so* clearly pointed out, that, if the passage were left to itself, every reader must at once discern the reference,—produces on the *Editors* no other effect, than that of deciding them to guard against such reference, by introducing the word "*God*" into the sentence, and thereby overturning the force of the context. It is enough for *these* critics, to have it in their power *to say*, that Christ is not *actually named;* and *therefore* Christ cannot be meant; and *therefore* the word "*God*" may be introduced into the text. Well then, let us go now to another passage, in which Christ *is* expressly named; and where, as in the passage before us, he is described as personally employed under the old dispensation, being specially designated as the Jehovah who was tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness. See I Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." The Greek in all the received copies, and as it is admitted also by *Griesbach*, stands thus: *Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καί τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων ἀπώλοντο.* Here, then, is CHRIST *named*, and clearly pointed out as existing under the Old Covenant. What is to be done now? Why, now that CHRIST *is named*, the word should be struck out; and *then* the text gives no support to the idea of our Lord's pre-existence. Certainly; all this is clear. But why strike it out? Because there are *some* MSS. that read *Κύριον*, *the Lord*, and there are one or two that read *Θεὸν*, *God*. Well, admit all this. What follows? Shall we take the report of *Griesbach* upon the evidence of the MSS. and Versions? That Critic, to whom the *Editors* affect at all times to appeal, and for the close adherence to whose *corrected text*, they were principally induced (as they assure us) to select *Archbishop Newcome's* translation as the basis of their own;—what effect do these variations of the MSS. produce upon *his* judgment? None whatever to lead him to disturb the usual reading of the text: which, on the fullest investigation, and after the interval even between the first and second editions of his work allowing ample time for farther consideration, he has pronounced to be the true one. *Erasmus*, also, the great favourite of the Unitarians, acknowledges "Christ" as the genuine reading, without dispute. *Locke* does the same. *Rosenmüller* does the same. *Wolf*, *Mill*, and *Whitby*, do the same. The last of these, indeed, asserts that the case is so clear, that "this reading ought not to be questioned." In truth there can be no reasonable doubt which way the evidence lies as to the true reading. And this is not disputed by the *Editors* themselves; not even by the *hottest* of their disputants, the *CALM Inquirer*. They huddle up the matter hastily by naming a couple of MSS. that read *Κύριον*, and one that reads *Θεὸν*, and then at once shelter themselves under the arbitrary reading of the word *Lord* by *Primate Newcome;* who, undoubtedly, in this, as well as in the passage

finding that Scripture, as it stands, will not sustain his system, imposes his own gloss for the language of the inspired

treated of above, and in some other parts of his translation of the N. T., has not acquitted himself in the manner most creditable to him, either as a Critic, or as a Theologian.

I must not omit to mention here, as it helps on the estimate of his general accuracy in *matters of fact*, that *Mr. Belsham*, by way of strengthening the evidence for the reading of Κύριον, quotes "*the Syriac Version*" in support of that reading: whereas *the Syriac* (that is, what every one who understands the subject calls by that name, the *ancient* Syriac, or *Peshito*) reads Χριστὸν; and it is only a *later* Syriac that gives Κύριον; and this, too, it must be observed, merely in the margin: yet *Mr. Belsham* unqualifiedly asserts as an authority for Κύριον, that THE SYRIAC VERSION reads it.—*Calm Inq.* pp. 157, 158. So much for *precision* and *truth*.

Well then, we have here a reading adopted by the Unitarians directly *against evidence;* for the express purpose of preventing the application of a passage to *Christ*, which *must establish his pre-existence*. It should be remembered, too, that even were we to admit the reading which the Unitarians require, nothing would be gained by them, unless they could make it appear, that, by the word *Lord*, (his familiar appellation throughout the N. T.,) Christ could not in this place have been intended. And even could they make this appear, they would then only have removed one text, from the multitude of those that support the doctrine. But, on the other hand, it is important for them to recollect, that, if the word "Christ" be (as the MSS. and Versions pronounce) the true reading, then the Unitarian doctrine is at an end; for then our Lord's divinity is at once established. If Christ was the Being, who was tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness, then he unavoidably becomes the Jehovah of the Old Testament. If they turn to *Erasmus*, to whom they so frequently appeal, he will tell them so; for he pronounces, that, if the word αὐτὸν belongs to the text, (a word, which is not only given to it by some MSS., but which cannot in sense be separated from it, as we shall hereafter see,) then the divinity of Christ is placed beyond all question—"*declaratur Christi divinitas*, quem a Judæis tentatum dicit priusquam hominem assumeret." And, accordingly, from this text, *Whitby* asserts, that the divinity of Christ was from old times demonstratively confirmed. The Unitarians, then, stake their denial of the divinity of our Lord, upon the propriety of their rejection of the word "*Christ*" from this text, in opposition to the authorities by which alone genuine Scripture can be ascertained: that is, they stake their very salvation on the adoption of a reading which is *against evidence*.

They would persuade themselves, indeed, that, even admitting "Christ" to be the true reading, they can still contrive a way to escape from the conclusion in favour of his divinity, by supposing the word *God* introduced into the sentence, after the clause, "as some of them also tempted."—"Nor let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted"—whom?—another being not yet spoken of—*God:*—"as some of them ALSO tempted *God*." Here, again, we have the word GOD fabricated, in like manner as we have seen it above in the passage of Hebrews. No one MS. Version or Father reads it, or supposes it. Indeed this is not pretended. It is admitted, also, that the original is *against* it; inasmuch as the *same* person is, agreeably to all the ordinary principles of construction, to be understood after the word "tempted," in the two corresponding clauses. And, accordingly, the *Imp. Vers.* renders the sentence, "Nor let us try the Lord, as some of

writer, and substitutes his system for Scripture. That just cause existed for the charge brought against the Unitarians,

them also tried *him.*" To this conclusion we should naturally be brought, even though the word Καὶ, ALSO, had no place in the sentence: but, *with this*, the meaning seems fixed beyond the reach of doubt. And, indeed, so long as the word Κύριον or Θεὸν is supposed to be the reading, the true principle of interpretation receives universal assent: but let Χριστὸν take their place, and it is at once abandoned: all the rules of grammar, and all the canons of construction, are, by this single change, instantly put to flight. "If we read Χριστὸν, the sense is: nor let us tempt, &c., Christ now; as some of them did God at that time." Thus say the *Editors*, and! NEWCOME. But let it be observed, that the word "also" has here been very *conveniently* forgotten. It would have sounded rather awkwardly, to speak of the Israelites, of that day, having ALSO provoked *God*, as the Corinthians (addressed by the Apostle) did *not* provoke him. Besides, it seems rather an odd way of keeping up the antithesis between the Corinthian converts and the early Israelites, which is so markedly carried on by the writer both before and after. The Corinthians are guarded against the *same* offences, (of idolatry, of fornication, and of rebellious murmuring,) of which their fathers had been guilty in the wilderness; and, in the midst of this enumeration, they are guarded against the tempting of a Being, *different* from that Being, whom their fathers had tempted; and against an offence, of course, *different* from that of their fathers!

But, to explain, a little more fully, the principles of translation adopted by the *Editors*, let us see how the matter exactly stands, according to their showing. If the sentence be, Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Κύριον, καθὼς καί τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν; then, they say, the translation is, "Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them ALSO tried *him.*" Or, if Θεὸν be substituted for Κύριον, they admit it to be, "Neither let us try God, as some of them ALSO tried *him.*" But if Χριστὸν be substituted, then it is, "Nor let us try Christ, as some of them ALSO tried [*some other being*; for example] "*God.*"—Wherefore GOD? So far as the original is concerned, any other Being might as well be introduced: no one MS. or reading of the original introduces this word after ἐπείρασαν; nor is *God* spoken of in the parts immediately preceding or following, so as to admit the possibility of implication from the context. Wherefore, then, the difference in the mode of translation? Wherefore any other, than the word "*him*," supplied as before? Wherefore the grammar and the construction, which are admitted, (and justly and unavoidably admitted,) where Κύριον or Θεὸν is the reading, immediately abandoned, when Χριστὸν comes in their place? The answer is plainly and simply this: and there can be no other:—that, unless this be done, the pre-existence and divinity of Christ must inevitably be conceded. Now, this being what *Mr. Belsham* and his brother *Editors* can never admit; it being for the very purpose of overturning such absurd and indefensible notions, that they have taken the trouble of engaging in the Version which they have given to the public; of course it follows, that no rules of construction, no principles of language, can be allowed, that will justify such a result: and thus this text, like others, is removed from the support of such incomprehensible doctrines.

So the process goes on, till the Unitarian is enabled to look round with triumph, and behold all subjected to his system. Having thus freely applied his theology to model both the text and the sense of Scripture; it is strange, if the text and the sense of Scripture do not yield support to his theology. He

of *altering the Scriptures to suit their own system*, seems plainly admitted by one of themselves, as we have seen at

may, surely, with much safety declare, that he can "find no evidence whatever to prove" the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, after he has himself defaced and purloined that evidence wherever it existed. He may now travel from *Dan* to *Beersheba*, and cry that all is barren, after he has made it so.—For the views of a scholar, a grammarian, and a critic, upon this verse, and upon the grammatical necessity that exists of supplying the word αὐτὸν, *him*, I refer the reader to the joint authority of *Glassius* and *Dathe*, *Philol. Sacr.* i. pp. 172, 173

I must add yet a few remarks more on the Unitarian management of the reading of the text in question. It has been seen that they reject the word Χριστὸν, *against the evidence* of the MSS. and Versions and Fathers: and again, that, apprehensive, that the weight of evidence will overbear that rejection, and that Χριστὸν will still be received as the true reading, they, *on this supposition*, reject καὶ against the preponderance of MSS., and they add Θεὸν at the end of the second clause, without even pretending any authority for doing so; but, solely, of their own arbitrary will and pleasure. But yet more; they do this in defiance of certain MSS. which actually connect the word αὐτὸν or αὐτῷ with ἐπείρασαν, and thereby make the word HIM a part of the text, to the necessary exclusion of the word which the *Editors* would introduce. Now, although the authority for the reading of the word HIM as part of the text, is actually stronger than that which appears in support of the word Θεὸν in the first clause, (a reading adopted by some, and spoken of with respect by the *Editors*,) yet, as its being part of the text could not make it one iota more certain, than it already appears from the construction, that it must be the same person, who is said to have been tempted in the second clause, that the Corinthians are warned not to tempt, in the first, I lay no stress whatever upon this circumstance: I merely mention it, to show the complication of defiance to *all* authorities, into which the *determination* to exclude the divinity of Christ, at every hazard, leads these Unitarian critics.

An assertion of *Mr. Belsham*, in the endeavour to support the reading of Κύριον instead of Χριστὸν, should not be passed over. He says, without qualification, "*Irenæus* CERTAINLY read Κύριον, Lord." (*Calm Inq.* p. 157.) Now in this *Mr. Belsham* is peremptorily opposed, not only by *Mill* and *Whitby*, but also by *Griesbach*. This, it is to be observed, is the *third* point on which he has been at variance with *Griesbach*, on the single reading of Κύριον: 1st, as to the resulting support of this reading by the *MSS. and Versions generally:* 2dly, as to its being the reading of *the Syriac Version:* and 3dly, as to its being the reading of *Irenæus*. In all these points the *Calm Inquirer* is not only egregiously wrong, but at direct variance with *Griesbach*. Now, with respect to *Griesbach*, it is full time to ask, whether this *great Editor*, the correctness of whose estimate of the readings of the Greek Testament has, for many years, been the subject of overflowing panegyric, and unqualified admiration with Unitarians, and the appearance of whose volumes is judged by them to have formed such an era in Biblical criticism, as to render it the fit time to produce a Version of the N. T. which might justly be called the "*Improved Version;*"—whether, I say, this *great Editor* is, after all, not to be relied upon in his report of the readings of the MSS. and Versions and Fathers; and this, also, in a text so important as to be, in itself, decisive of our Lord's Divinity?—It is not, however, an easy matter to satisfy Unitarians in the readings of Scripture. It

page 114 of this volume; where (with an ingenuousness not exactly characteristic of the Sect) the writer confesses, and

is rather difficult to hit their taste in this respect. And, in truth, now that they have completed an *Improved Version* to their own satisfaction, the only thing wanted is, that they should supply a *Greek text*, which shall correspond with their Version. What they have done is sufficient for the man of "sound understanding," whose knowledge does not extend beyond the language of the translation: what remains to be done is requisite for those who, to an acquaintance with the Greek, may, in judging of the translation, associate the strange fancy to know what is contained in the original. That original, it is manifest, (I mean an original for *their* translation,) is not supplied by *Griesbach*. And indeed it is quite time for them to give him up.

But, it is not merely with *Griesbach* that the Unitarians are getting out of humour. Even their fast friend *Marcion* they have fallen foul of, on this, and some other texts. *Mr. Belsham* reports, from *Epiphanius*, that *Marcion* introduced the false reading of *Christ*, into this text, in place of Κύριον, *Lord*. And this same *Marcion*, both he and the *I. V.* likewise charge (on the authority of *Tertullian*) with having introduced the false reading of Κύριον into the text of 1 Cor. xv. 47: which text will be treated of in the ensuing note. (See *Calm Inq.* pp. 158. 120, and *I. V.* p. 403.) It would seem as if this purloining heretic was influenced by a spirit of retribution; the word, which he is said to have stolen from one part of the Epistle, being replaced by him in another. But with respect to this *Marcion*, it must be remembered that this is the very same *Marcion*, on whose authority the *Calm Inquirer* and his brother *Editors* have peremptorily rejected the first two chapters of St. Luke, in opposition to all the MSS., the Versions, and the Fathers; the same *Marcion*, whom the Editors see no reason not to consider, "as a man of learning and INTEGRITY"; (*I. V.* p. 120;) the same *Marcion*, of whom *Mr. Belsham* professes himself disposed to think very favourably, more especially as being a brother heretic; and in the behalf of whom he expresses the strongest indignation against *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, for the charges they have brought against him, of corrupting the Scriptures; alleging, that these Fathers, in this and the other charges which they have advanced to vilify the character of *Marcion*, have but indulged the true spirit of orthodoxy; which he characterizes as a spirit of calumny and malignity, the same in all ages of the world. (*Lett. on Arian.* p. 72, and *Answer to the Brief Mem.* pp. 115, 116.) Yet this very *Marcion*, whose *integrity* as a witness of the uncorrupted Gospel of St. Luke is thus rescued from the calumnies of those Orthodox libellers, *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, is here charged with adulterating the Epistle of St. Paul, in the two passages referred to: and this, upon the authority of those very libellers, to whom, we have been told, we ought to yield no credit. Such is the honest consistency of these worthy Unitarians (to whom "TRUTH" is supposed *not* to be "THE OBJECT OF AVERSION AND ABHORRENCE") on every point, on which it seems practicable to filch away some portion of the evidence for the divinity of Christ.

Were we now to ask these *new libellers* of *Marcion*, in what manner his corruptions of these passages could have passed into the copies of the Orthodox; who must, as we are informed, have viewed him with such malignity; and by whom we know that both he and his followers were strenuously opposed, and his copies of the N. T. attacked as spurious, (*Mill, Proleg.* p. 36,)—they would not find it very easy to give an answer.

It is remarkable, that *Mr. Lindsey*

regrets, that they have followed "*no standard text*" whatever; that is, in other words, that they have modified the

has made a long quotation from *Mill*, for the purpose of supporting, by *his* authority, the supposition that *Marcion's* corruption of one of these texts, 1 Cor. xv. 47, had crept into the Greek copies of this Epistle: at the same time that *Mill* has expressly retracted his error as to that supposition, and has argued, as above referred to, in defence of its direct contradiction: and yet more, that even in the very note from which *Mr. Lindsey* has taken his quotation, and in a part immediately following it, this change of opinion is declared, and the desire that it should be particularly noticed distinctly set forth,—"indicta esse jubet,"—and the very place also pointed out, in which the reasons for the change are assigned. Yet *Mr. Lindsey* has abided by the disowned opinion; has omitted all notice of the retractation; and has left upon record, as the true and deliberate opinion of *Mill*, that which *Mill* has declared and proved to be erroneous. See *Lindsey's Sequel*, p. 267, and *Mill*, p. 398, *Proleg.* pp. 36. 140. What are the peculiar qualities of the Socinian apostasy, that can work such effects upon the mind of such a man as we are told *Mr. Lindsey* was!

Again, to drop all further consideration of this absurd notion of *Marcion's* corruptions having passed into our present copies, and spread through the Versions and Fathers, let us examine in what way the word Χριστὸν (in the passage with which we are immediately concerned) could have slid into the place of Κύριον, or Θεὸν, in the ancient MSS. What error of transcribing can we imagine to have produced such an effect? Here, indeed, we have an instance of the length, to which certain Commentators, who are in the habit of taking liberties with the sacred text, will be carried in the support of an hypothesis. On the authority of a *single* manuscript, (on the reading of which MS. also there is thrown a suspicion by *Wetstein*, which is not rejected by *Griesbach*,) *Grotius*, and, after him, *Wakefield*, (adding *his* mite of a *single* Version, and that the *Ethiopic*, which the Unitarians themselves have condemned him for rating too highly,) have adopted the reading of Θεὸν for Χριστὸν: and have done so on the supposition, that, in the abbreviated mode of writing, the one word was mistaken by the transcriber for the other; $\overline{\text{XN}}$ for ΘΝ. Now, it is singular enough, that, when the accidental transition from ΘC to OC has been contended for, as an admissible supposition, in the text in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where also numerous MSS. and other authorities actually exhibit the former of the two words, at this very day; and where (as far as the MSS. are concerned) the mere wearing out of the two straight lines would (independently of the errors of transcribing) effect the change, of which indeed we seem to have satisfactory evidence from the fact itself as to the *Alexandrian*;—this supposition is, at once, rejected by a certain class of critics; whilst, in the case before us, where the form of X is to pass into that of Θ, the transition is considered as not unlikely. The cases, however, it must be admitted, differ in one material respect. The one supposition *is* in favour of the orthodox doctrine: and the other *not*. And whatever favours the Orthodox deserves no quarter. I speak not here, merely in reference to the insane and vulgar rant, in which such writers as the *Calm Inquirer* never fail to indulge, against whatever bears the name of Orthodox, (see pp. 200. 210, &c.,) but I allude even to one of the grave and deliberate canons of criticism laid down by *Griesbach*, in his *Prolegomena*, (p. lxvi,) where he pronounces, that, "amongst different readings of the text, that one is to be suspected, which most favours the opinions of the Orthodox." From which, at least, it is reasonable to infer,

text of the N. T. just as they found it answerable to their purpose. It is not, however, wonderful, that they have done

that whatever readings, in favour of the Orthodox opinion, may have had *his* sanction, have not been preferred by him from any bias in behalf of Orthodoxy. This is a very material observation; and it serves at the same time to assign a cause for the extravagance of Unitarian panegyric which has been bestowed upon this writer, and to confer a value of no small amount upon his concessions to Orthodoxy.

To return to the subject of the change pretended to be made in the reading of the text before us,—I recommend to the reader the following observations of *Mill*:—"Quasi vero proclive fuerit librariis Χ scribere pro Θ: aut lectionem qualis illa Κύριον aut Θεὸν commodam, mutare in duriorem hanc, et ad quam impegerint lectores, Χριστὸν. Certe, cum Editis congruant non solum IRENÆUS," (*certainly not*, says *Mr. Belsham*,) "*Theodotus* in ἱστορίαις, ac Scriptores Gr. Lat. complures; sed et Exemplaria MSS. universim, et quidem *Clar.* Gr. Lat. *Ger.* Gr. Lat. quique Marcionis tempora præcessisse videtur Interpres Vulgatus; *omnino crediderim* ab Apostolo ipso scriptum Χριστὸν: *mutatum autem hoc in* Θεὸν, *ab audaculo quodam studioso, cui minus verum, si placet, quod ex recepta lectione dicitur, Israelitas tentasse* CHRISTUM *in deserto.*" This last clause very truly expresses the state of the case. The more than "audaculi studiosi," with whom we are concerned, not being able to reconcile themselves to the idea, that *Christ* had been actually tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness, have therefore presumed, that "*Christ*" cannot have been the word used by the Apostle: and, on the strength of this presumption, insist on substituting for it, even against evidence, Θεὸν or Κύριον. For the former of these two words very few, indeed, have ventured to contend: and, by the latter, which the *Editors* would force upon us, not much (as has been already observed) is gained to their cause, unless they can make it appear, that, by "*the Lord*," CHRIST is not here intended.—On the application of this title Κύριος, *the Lord*, to CHRIST, by the writers of the N. T.; I would particularly recommend to the reader the admirable remarks of *Pearson*, in his *Exposition*, pp. 145—150. I would request of him, also, to observe the great number of instances in which not only throughout the N. T. at large, but specially in this very chapter of 1 Corinthians, CHRIST is *emphatically* designated by this title. It is of importance likewise (and particularly on the present occasion) to recollect, that this title of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, by which Jesus Christ is so constantly named in the New Testament, is the Greek word employed by the Jews as equivalent to *Jehovah* in the Old; and that by this very name of "*Jehovah*," it is declared by the prophet Jeremiah, (xxiii. 6,) that *Christ* was to be called; as, indeed, we find it admitted by the Jewish writers themselves, who derive from *this* text the proof that JEHOVAH was to be the true name of the *Messiah*. I allude to this passage of Jeremiah the more willingly, because it gives me an opportunity of stating that the attempts, which have been recently made by *Dr. Carpenter* and *Mr. Belsham* to escape from the force and application of the prophet's language, have been counteracted and chastised so completely by the successive publications of *Dr. Nares* and *Bishop Burgess*, that scarcely any thing farther can be desired upon this subject. See *Dr. Nares's Remarks, &c.*, pp. 46—51, 2d ed., and *The Bible, &c.*, pp. 96. 103. The latter, in particular, seems almost to exhaust the subject.

I am here, however, obliged to protest against the position of a learned Professor, in one of the English Universities, who has lately affirmed, in his Lectures, that "in the Septuagint the

so. They have been driven to it by the necessity of the case. For, not only was there to be found *no* existing trans-

word Jehovah is *never* expressed by Θεὸς, but *uniformly* by Κύριος." That this position is directly contradicted by the fact, is so notorious, that it is quite inconceivable how the learned Professor could have been led to make it: nor, indeed, should I have thought it necessary to observe upon this mistake, if it were not connected with an argument, whose bearing is too important to suffer it to pass unnoticed. The word Jehovah, the Professor says, being considered by the Jews as a word too sacred for human utterance; whenever they met with this word in the Bible, they read for it another word expressive not of *God*, but of *Lord:* and hence he accounts for the peculiarity of the Septuagint translation alleged in his position. And thus, in truth, whilst the Professor has stated in words, that "JEHOVAH" is *always* expressed in the Septuagint by Κύριος, he evinces, by his argument, that he means to say, that the name "JEHOVAH" is *never* so expressed; since it is not "JEHOVAH," but another word, implying *Lord,* (by which he must mean אדני,) that was rendered by the word Κύριος in the LXX. But the argument of the learned Professor, I cannot avoid saying, has as little foundation in reason, as the result which he derives from it has in fact. To give the argument any force, the *Seventy* must be supposed to have translated, not from a written copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, but from hearing them read: or it must be contended, that not only the *Tetragrammaton* itself was deemed a word too sacred for human utterance, but that its translation into any other language was deemed not merely too sacred to be uttered, but even to be written; a degree of sacredness not attached even to the original word itself. Neither of these suppositions can be maintained. The argument used by the Professor had been formerly advanced by Crellius against the Divinity of Christ, and has been most triumphantly confuted by Pearson, who has clearly shown that the hypothesis which lies at the foundation of the whole is a mere vulgar error. It is, indeed, a matter of regret, that the authority of the Professor's name should afford any colour for the revival of this Socinian cavil. But whilst, in truth, no name can sustain it, it is fortunate, that the principle of its immediate refutation is found in the very position laid down by the Professor himself. For, had the LXX been really governed by the rule which has been prescribed to them, the word JEHOVAH would have been (as the Professor has alleged it to be) *uniformly* expressed by Κύριος, and *never* by Θεός. But, as the fact is otherwise, and JEHOVAH is *not* uniformly expressed by Κύριος, but sometimes by Θεὸς, it follows, that the LXX were not governed by this rule.

It is indeed true, that Κύριος is the word by which JEHOVAH is *generally* rendered in the Septuagint; *so* generally, that it is not wonderful, that, from want of proper attention, its universality should be actually inferred. And, from this results the fair and natural conclusion, which we have already contended for, that the Jews, when using the Greek language, would consider the word Κύριος as equivalent to JEHOVAH. And, indeed, whoever wishes to see how peculiarly this word was, in its primary sense, adapted to convey the force of the Hebrew term, will receive the fullest satisfaction from *Pearson's* observations, at p. 147 of his *Exposition.* How differently from that profound thinker and learned writer do the light and airy critics of the *Imp. Vers.* treat this word, which was so habitually employed, in Jewish acceptation, as the name of the great Jehovah! In their modern and jaunty phrase, it is, in many cases, disguised under the unmeaning appellation of *Sir,* or *Master;* and

lation, which does not directly war with their system; but there was *no* Greek text, to be discovered, from which, by

might nearly as well, so far as the conveyance of its true and original import is concerned, have been translated *Esquire*. For the true value of this word as applied to Christ by the Fathers, the reader may consult *Suicer. Thes. Eccl.* ii. 193, &c.

We have seen, in this note, no small variety in the exercises of Unitarian ingenuity, for the convenient modification of the text in question. First, the word "CHRIST" must be rejected from the text, and the word "LORD" substituted in its place. Secondly, if "CHRIST" must be retained, then, to do away the effect of this, the word "ALSO" must be struck out, and the word "*God*" must be supplied, from the translator's own sovereign pleasure. And, lastly, to guard against such an application of the title LORD, either here or elsewhere, as might intimate the divinity of Christ, they are careful, everywhere, to break the connexion between this word and the sacred name of JEHOVAH, and to reduce it, on all occasions, to the insignificancy of the most ordinary appellative. But a contrivance not less extravagant than any of these remains to be noticed. It is the invention of a *Mr. Simpson*, communicated in a work which he has entitled *Essays on the Language of Scripture;* and which, from the specimen produced, I rejoice that I have never seen. The contrivance is neither more nor less than this:—to turn "*Christ*" into *Moses*, and, at the same time, to let the word stand *also* for the Messiah. "'Nor let us try the Anointed,' *i. e.* the Messiah, (Acts, x. 38,) 'as some of them also tried the Anointed,' *i. e.* Moses." The word "*Christ*," then, we see, denotes both *Jesus* and *Moses:* and, consequently, the whole difficulty arising from the supposition, that it was the same Christ who had been tempted by the Israelites, that might now be tempted by the Corinthians, is entirely done away. After this, what is there that words may not mean, in the vocabulary of a Unitarian Commentator? This, too, it must be noticed, is mentioned with much approbation by *Dr. Carpenter*, who quotes it, and other matter equally precious, from the same writer, at p. 229 of *Unit. the Doct.* &c. And, as this publication of *Dr. Carpenter* is (I apprehend) the latest of the Unitarian productions that treat of this part of Scripture, we have reason to consider this as their latest and most recognised exposition of the text. However, the very extravagance of this, their last approved interpretation, carries with it the concession of the two points contended for in this note: namely, that "Christ" is the true reading of the text, and that the same word "Christ" is to be applied to the verb "*tempted*" in the two corresponding clauses. As to this one word denoting, in these clauses, two different persons, that is the concern of those who defend this solution. The more untenable it is, the more manifest the cogency of the admissions that have compelled it.

To sum up the whole, I shall now subjoin the Greek text, as it stands with the *unanimous* consent of the printed copies, (*Griesbach* of course included,) and the several translations of the passage, as they are given in the Received Version and by the Unitarians.

Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καί τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν.

Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted. *Rec. Vers.*

Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them also tried him. *Imp. Vers.*

Nor let us try Christ now, as some of them tried God at that time. *Imp. Vers. note.*

Nor let us try the Anointed, (the Messiah,) as some of them also tried the Anointed (Moses). *Mr. Simpson, as quoted by Dr. Carpenter.*

By which of these Versions the reader

any thing that could (even by them) be called a translation, they could derive it. They have been, therefore, compelled, not only to *invent* (I must term it) a new translation for the text, but also to *invent* a new text for the translation. Their plan, in a word, has been, first to shape the Scripture according to their theory; and then to establish their theory, by the Scripture. In truth, it is scarcely possible for any person who has not submitted to the odious labour of examining for himself, (an odious labour *I* can truly aver it to be,) to form an adequate idea, of the mode in which the Sacred Word has been abused and falsified, throughout the version (or it should rather be entitled *perversion*) of the New Testament by the Unitarians. Examples abound, of a nature similar to that which has been just adduced: and many of a quality yet more insidious and dishonest.

But the point with which we are at present more immediately concerned is not so much the departure from the

is *honestly* treated, with regard to the original, he may judge for himself.—For the most valuable remarks, both on the reading and true interpretation of this important text, I refer the reader to *Cameron*, whom I have often found strong reasons to recommend, as a judicious Commentator. (See *Crit. Sac.* vii. pp. 2992, 2993.) *Wolf* also deserves to be consulted. *Cur. Phil.* in locum. *Diodati's* translation is, as usual, correct; and on the word "*Christ*," supplies this pointed marginal illustration, "Il quale è quell' ANGELO, che andava col popolo; chiamato così per lo suo *ufficio;* e SIGNORE IDDIO, per la sua *natura*."—*Doddridge*, also, is well deserving of notice. He adds to a good explanation of the original, "This is a considerable *text* in proof of Christ's residence with the *Church* in the Wilderness, as the *angel* of God's presence."—On the "*rock that followed*" the Israelites, being called "*Christ*," in a verse preceding this one and treating on the same general subject, it may be worth while to remark, that *Grotius* uses the following words:—"Deus צור in Veteri Test. Christus in Novo." This, with good reason. The same ROCK, which *Jehovah* is called in the O. T., our Lord Jesus Christ is justly called in the New. But, the remark, it is to be remembered, is *Grotius's*. I mention this for the satisfaction of *Unitarians*.—Indeed, considering that they wish much to represent him as a fellow-labourer, they are obliged very often to quarrel with him. When, in following on the resemblance between the ROCK in the Wilderness and Christ, he is led to make the following observations:—"Christus ad mortem percussus spiritum suis obtinuit:" and "Christus per spiritum nobiscum est ad finem sæculi:" he is pretty smartly rebuked by *Mr. Lindsey*, who professes himself dissatisfied with his too refined and unwarranted allusions. (*Sequel*, &c., p. 260.) But it was more than the *refinement* of the allusion, that here displeased *Mr. Lindsey*.

Primate or *Griesbach*, or from the MSS. Versions and Fathers, nor yet the imposition of a false text, as the departure from the *Primate*, WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGMENT. It must, indeed, be admitted, that, with respect to the clause hitherto considered, the *Editors* are not chargeable on this head: for, in their note, they confess, that, both in the *Greek* and *Newcome*, the reading is, "See that ye refuse not him who speaketh." But they take care to acknowledge nothing more. They give not the slightest intimation of their studied variations from the Primate, in the succeeding clauses of the verse, devised for the purpose of adjusting its several parts to that application of the passage, which their hypothesis requires, and which is precisely contradictory to that of *Newcome*. How laboriously and carefully this is done, may be seen on looking to the two contrasted renderings at page 116 of this volume. It should also be particularly observed, that, in their note, the Editors enter into an argument, for the purpose of shewing that *Christ* is not the object of reference in this passage; and yet they never once let fall the most remote hint, that the *Primate* has so translated it, as to lead to a directly opposite conclusion; much less, that he has drawn out that conclusion in a note, the sole purpose of which is to mark to the reader's attention, that our Lord is here alluded to by the writer, as "the *Angel of the Covenant*, who presided at giving the Law." The notice which they have taken of the *Primate's* rendering of the *first clause* does not (it should be remembered) necessarily convey any idea of a difference between him and them on the main subject and true sense of the entire passage: since, under the words, "him who speaketh," the *Primate* might possibly have understood GOD, although he might not think it right to introduce it into the text. And as the *Editors* inform us, that, by these words, GOD must evidently have been intended, and, at the same time, acknowledge no other difference than the mere use of these words in the *Primate's* translation, they have, in truth, given the reader to understand that there *is* no other; although, both in the text and notes, he and they

are diametrically opposed: his version of this passage involving in it a direct declaration of the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his HEAVENLY ORIGIN[a]; whilst

[a] I had conceived that, in Number III. (pp. 148—160,) I had noticed the principal evasions and glosses, by which the Unitarians have struggled (although with little effect) to escape from the admission of our Lord's *heavenly* origin and pre-existence. These, however, it is not easy to exhaust. Another, and of very important bearing, is to be found, in their treatment of the passage in 1 Cor. xv. 47. The Greek of this text runs thus, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός· ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. But, from the variations of MSS. *Griesbach* is induced to think it *probable*, that the word κύριος is not genuine, and that οὐρανοῦ should be followed by ὁ οὐράνιος. The Received Version, abiding by the Greek, renders the passage, "The first man *is*, of the earth, earthy: the second man *is* the Lord from heaven." The *Vulgate* reads "Primus homo de terra, terrenus: secundus homo de cœlo, cœlestis:"—to which the old Version of *Wiclif* adheres, "The firste man of erthe is ertheli, the secunde man of hevene is hevenli." Whether we abide by the Greek or the Latin reading of this text, is of little consequence as to the main point, in which they perfectly agree: namely, that the words, ἐκ γῆς, express the origin of the *first Adam*; and the words, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, express the origin of the *second Adam*; that is, as *Bishop Burgess* justly distinguishes, "not the origin of his mortal frame, but the origin of HIM who assumed that mortal frame. Whether the word κύριος be expressed or not, is a matter of little moment, (and its application indeed must follow as a consequence,) if it be admitted, that the second Adam came from heaven, when he first appeared upon this earth. The Unitarians, accordingly, to avoid a confession so completely ruinous to their cause, render the passage thus: "The first man *was* from the ground, earthy: the second man *will be* from heaven [heavenly]." Now, here, we have a change of tense, which not only has no foundation in either the Greek or the Latin text, but is in direct opposition to both; since in both the perfect sameness of the corresponding clauses obviously determines the sameness of the tense. The total inadmissibility of this *arbitrary* rendering of the Unitarians, and the grossness of their endeavour to pervert the sense of Scripture in this important passage, have been already so triumphantly exposed by *Bishop Burgess*, that it is unnecessary for me to add any thing farther upon these subjects. I shall, therefore, confine myself, simply, to the mode in which it has been attempted to sustain the Unitarian version of the passage by *Mr. Belsham*; whose special office it is (as we have already had frequent occasion to observe) to vamp the flimsy criticisms of the *Imp. Vers.* with the equally flimsy material of the *Calm Inquiry*.

The grand point to be established for the Unitarians, is, as we have seen, the use of the *future*, in the second clause of the text:—"the second man WILL BE from heaven:"—for, if we read "WAS from heaven," *actum est!* it is all over with the Unitarians; inasmuch as, in this passage, the origin of the BEING, without any possible pretence as to the *doctrines*, is unequivocally the subject. How does *Mr. Belsham* proceed? Having made a good deal of flourish, as the *I. V.* had also done before him, about the words κύριος and οὐράνιος; having also lumped together some irrelevant matter about the Polish Socinians and *Dr. Price*; and having observed somewhat upon the interpretation of *Newcome*, *Whitby*, and *Alexander*; having, in short, appeared to say a good deal, whilst he took care to preserve a profound silence throughout,

theirs excludes, not only his *pre-existence* and *heavenly descent*, but himself altogether, from the import of the original.

(as the *I. V.* also has done,) respecting any arguments in favour of the *future tense* in the second clause,—the single point on which the entire question rests,—he, all of a sudden, very calmly and composedly asserts, "The Vulgate renders the text, 'The first man was of the earth, earthy. The second man will be from heaven, heavenly.'" (*Calm Inq.* p. 121.) He then triumphantly concludes; and all is settled. In this manner, one text after another, of those that proclaim our Lord's pre-existence, is extinguished by the *Calm Inquirer* and his Coadjutors. And so the cause of Socinian expurgation goes forward.

Perhaps, in the annals of dishonest controversy another instance like this is not to be found. A discussion of unimportant matter is *busily* kept up: the main point of difference, and in truth the only one deserving of attention, the *change of tense*, is passed over, as if it were a thing not at all in dispute: the Vulgate is then quoted, *in direct opposition to the truth*, as reading the words "WAS," and "WILL BE," in the two corresponding clauses: and thus, indirectly, the false rendering of the text by the Unitarians is sustained by a false quotation from the Vulgate; and by a quotation which the author, if his memory had lasted from one page to the other, must have known to be false; since, in the preceding page, he had himself cited the very words of the Vulgate:—"Primus homo de terra, terrenus: secundus homo de cœlo, cœlestis:"—in which words, there is not only no justification of the change from WAS to WILL BE; but there is, on the contrary, as in the original Greek, a declaration, as strong as the analogies of language will admit, that the tense employed in the first clause must pass unchanged into the second. In a word, there is given by the Vulgate itself a direct contradiction to the report which is made of it by the *Calm Inquirer*. The man of "sound understanding," however, whom he addressed in *English* on the one page, being possibly not exactly acquainted with what was contained in the *Latin* on the other, and being consequently unaware that his author was imposing on him a false translation, would of course be fully satisfied on the authority of the Vulgate, (more especially, as so much had been said to leave the general impression of uncertainty as to the true reading of the *Greek* text, and the consequent opinion, that the *Vulgate* was the only ancient authority to be relied on,) that in this passage could be found no proof of our Lord's pre-existence! What are we to think of the cause that needs such support; and what of the interests that can attract such supporters!

As to the passage itself, having been led to notice it, I cannot forbear recommending to the reader the admirable discussion which it receives from *Bishop Burgess*, pp. 87—92 of *The Bible*, &c. The manner in which this learned Prelate has treated the important subject to which it relates is such, that I do not fear to pronounce, that any candid reader, who will carefully examine what he has advanced, will find in it a complete and irrefragable argument for the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, even had Scripture not spoken elsewhere, so unequivocally and repeatedly, upon the subject. To the valuable remarks which are there to be found I shall add but a few observations. On the 45th verse of the chapter with which we are concerned,—a verse which, the bishop justly observes, is "a trying passage for an Unitarian," and on which, accordingly, the Editors of the *I. V.* and their brother commentators all cautiously abstain from making any remark,—we find the following distinction laid down by *Cyril*, in speaking of the difference between the first and se-

In the treatment, then, of this passage of *Hebrews*, we find, at the same time, a direct fabrication of Scripture, and a

cond Adam, as to the nature of that *life*, which, in this verse, is specified to belong respectively to each. *Grotius* thus translates the words of that Father: "In Adam fuit ἰσχυηδεώτης quædam ad vivendum, in Christo ἐνέργεια." This admirably marks that inherent power of giving life, that πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν τῷ τῆς Θειότητος λόγῳ of the writer against the doctrine of *Apollinarius*, which is also quoted by *Grotius* on Mark ii. 8; and which, in his note on 1 Cor. xv. 45, he describes to be (although he improperly traces its origin) "potestas etiam aliis dandi vitam, et quidem æternam."—Excellent distinctions, on the subject of these verses, are given by several of the *Fathers*, as quoted by *Suicer*. (*Thes. Eccl.* i. 80, 81. 353.) The observations of that judicious commentator *Cameron*, both on verse 45 and 47, deserve to be quoted. On verse 45 he says, "Opponit Apostolus *spiritum animæ*, deinde *viventi vivificantem*: hoc enim majus est illo: nam qui dicit *viventem*, denotat actum *immanentem* in aliquo; qui vero dicit *vivificantem*, non modo actum in aliquo immanentem denotat, sed etiam emanantem et promanantem, quique in alio recipitur." And, on the words, Ὁ Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, in verse 47, he says: "Sic notat Apostolus haud dubie originem Christi hominis, qui *e cœlo* dicitur esse, non quod homo e cœlo ad nos descenderit, sed quod Spiritus Sancti vi humana natura coagmentata fuit et coaptata Divinæ naturæ. Sic cum quæsivit Christus a Pharisæis, *namquid Baptisma Johannis esset a cœlo*, non hoc voluit, num Johannis baptisma esset e cœlo delapsum, sed, an autorem habuerit cœlestem." *Dr. Doddridge* also deserves to be consulted on these two verses: and *Dr. Nares's* remarks on the latter of them, in refutation of *Dr. Carpenter*, are particularly worthy of observation.

I cannot forbear, also, for the satisfaction of Unitarians, who are so desirous of claiming *Mr. Locke* as a favourer of their doctrines, giving that writer's view of the passage in question. His paraphrase of the 47th, 48th, and 49th verses is as follows:—"The first man was of the earth, made up of dust, or earthy particles: *the second man is the Lord from heaven.* Some, who have no higher an extraction, than barely from the earthy man, they, like him, have barely an animal life and constitution: but those, who are regenerate, and born of the heavenly seed, are, as he that is heavenly, spiritual and immortal. And, as in the animal, corruptible, mortal state we were born in, we have been like him, that was earthy; so also shall we, who, at the resurrection, partake of a spiritual life from Christ, be made like him, the Lord from heaven, heavenly, *i. e.* live, as the *spirits in heaven do*, without the need of food, or nourishment, to support it, and without infirmities, decay, and death, enjoying a fixed, stable, unfleeting life."—Here is the succour, which *Mr. Locke* gives to those, who pronounce Jesus Christ to have been a mere man: who deny, that he can be said, in the obvious sense of the words, to have come from heaven: who, in truth, deny that there is any such place as heaven: who ridicule the notion of separate spirits; and still more the idea of their having a local or heavenly residence.

I must yet go farther, and quote from one writer more, even from *Mr. Wakefield* himself. He thus renders the 47th and 48th verses:—"The first, a man from the ground, *was* dust: the second, a man from heaven, *was* heavenly. They that *are* earthy, *are* like the *Adam* of the ground; and they that *are* heavenly, like him from heaven." I the more willingly refer to this writer, because it affords me the opportunity of noticing an additional act of disingenu-

gross and deliberate imposition upon the reader, as to the *Primate's* translation.—And this, too, it should be recol-

ousness, in the Editors of the *I. V.*, who, in their note on the 47th verse, have adduced this author's name in such a manner, as to impress the reader with the belief that their novel version has he support of his authority, whilst his translation is *directly the opposite* of theirs: he reading "*was*" in both clauses of the verse, and admitting the *heavenly* origin of Christ; whilst the whole force, or rather trick, of their version consists in an endeavour to exclude the notion of that *heavenly* origin, by the arbitrary introduction of the future "*will be.*" Thus, as we have before seen the *Vulgate* turned to dishonest account, in that supplement to the Version entitled the *Calm Inquiry*, we here find *Mr. Wakefield* turned to the same account, in the Version itself. And hence it is manifest, that EVEN *Wakefield* will not answer the purposes of the *modern* Socinians.

Were it indeed worth the trouble, abundance of reason might be produced, from a comparison of the two versions, why the *Editors* of the *Imp. Version* did not adopt *Wakefield's* as the basis of theirs. Some hobbling reasons, that cannot well be understood, are assigned by them for this determination, in the first page of their *Introduction.* But there was a *prudence* in it, of which they seem not disposed to boast. Departures from a *Bishop* of the *Established Church* were, of course, to be expected. But if they appeared *very frequently* to desert WAKEFIELD, as not pushing his version far enough for *their* objects, it might furnish too open a disclosure of what those objects were, and thereby defeat the system of *proselytism* in which they have of late years so strenuously engaged; since all, who possessed *any* moderation of judgment, must naturally be put upon their guard against translators of the New Testament, who were obliged to abandon *even* WAKEFIELD, as not heterodox enough. On *Mr. Wakefield's* translation of the 47th verse I have one observation more to make; viz. that he professes, in this, exactly to follow the *Vulgate.* I leave his translation, then, to stare at *Mr. Belsham's*, which has been given at page 234.

Having hitherto been employed, in this note, in adducing authorities *against* the Unitarian version of I Cor. xv. 47, I should not deal fairly, if I did not also bring forward one or two authorities, which I have happened to light upon, *in its behalf.* The well-known *P. Harduin*, in his commentary upon this place, is of opinion, that the ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ of the 45th verse, means *any man* indifferently, but such as he will be after his resurrection.—*Jehnio* goes yet farther. He is of opinion that even the phrase, Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, is designed to be applied to *every man*, after his resurrection, (in which state he denominates him δεύτερος,) because he then triumphs over death, and is immortal!—Here, surely, are flights of interpretation, worthy even of *Unitarian* wing. Here, too, not only is the *future* let in, to the perfect satisfaction of the Unitarians; but, to their equal satisfaction, our Lord Jesus Christ is altogether thrust out. There is a freedom, likewise, from *all* ancient prejudices, which might recommend particularly to their notice the former of these writers, who has discovered that our Saviour and his apostles preached in *Latin;* and that almost all the classical productions, ascribed to the great writers of antiquity, are monkish forgeries of the middle ages. He possesses, in a word, that towering quality of "*thinking for himself,*" the grand characteristic by which Unitarians seek to be distinguished, and which manifestly must belong to all such as can find no others to *think with them.* Whether the latter has distinguished himself by equally free exercises of his genius, I

lected, as in the other instances which we have adduced on a subject of vital bearing on the Unitarian scheme.

know not: but both seem worthy to assist Unitarians in their critical researches after truth.

In the preceding page, some conjectural reasons were assigned for the change of the original intention, formed by the Unitarians, of making *Wakefield's* translation of the N. T. the basis of theirs. Many parts of his Version, as was there hinted, it would have puzzled them much to accommodate to their favourite scheme: and then, it being necessary to speak in unqualified terms of the superior learning of the only scholar they had got amongst them, and, besides, he being of that description of Critic, who *can never be wrong*, but with whom all is *certain* and *undeniable* that *he* affirms, it would have defeated their purpose to have employed him as a constant fellow-labourer; since, in that case, they could not have upheld both him and their system. One must, necessarily, have been sacrificed to the other. But, by their present plan, both are judiciously preserved. He is called in wherever he happens to coincide with the *Editors;* and then he comes forward, as if he bore the very Urim and Thummim on his breast,—learned, profound, and incontrovertible,—and he is prudently forgotten on those more numerous occasions where his appearance would be unseasonable. One instance may be sufficient to give an idea of the difficulties which the *Editors* would have frequently to experience, not only in their contests with *Mr. Wakefield's* CERTAINTIES, but in the contests among those CERTAINTIES themselves. I the more willingly advert to it, because it brings to view another important testimony from the words of Scripture, in support of the general doctrine maintained throughout this and the foregoing notes, and the NUMBER to which they are annexed.

On John xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah, when he saw his Glory," &c. *Mr. Wakefield* observes,—"The PROPER ANTECEDENT to *αὐτοῦ* MOST CERTAINLY is *Jesus*, he being the *Predicate* of the context." (*Enquiry*, &c. p. 135.)—Again, "*αὐτοῦ* MUST BE in terpreted of *God*, and NOT of *Jesus*"—"*the Lord—the King—Jehovah of hosts*,"—"is the ONLY ANTECEDENT to *αὐτοῦ*:" and he adds, "This appears to me UNDENIABLE." (*New Test.* i. 398.) Now as that which is CERTAIN cannot well be supposed, in the mind which perceives that *certainty*, to differ from that which appears to the same mind to be UNDENIABLE, it should follow, that *Mr. Wakefield* has here established the identity of CHRIST with the JEHOVAH of the O. T., which is exactly what the orthodox maintain to be the true import of the passage before us. This, however, cannot, for a moment, be admitted by the Unitarian Editors; who strain every nerve to prove that this cannot possibly be the meaning of the text; and who must consequently contend, that what *Mr. Wakefield* saw to be CERTAINLY TRUE, directly *denied* that which he *also* saw to be UNDENIABLE. It was at different times, it must, indeed, be confessed. But then, what he saw at *each* time, was (in the usual Unitarian style) "CERTAIN;" was "UNDENIABLE." He is, indeed, entirely their own in every thing, but as possessing some little matter of learning; or, I should rather say,—of *scholarship*. —On the passage just alluded to, our Unitarian *Editors* have, according to custom, falsified their authorities by a partial quotation. They have quoted *Dr. Clarke* upon it, *as if he exactly agreed with them;* while in the rest of his observations upon this text (on which they are *discreetly silent*) he is employed in proving, that *Christ* is here and elsewhere described in the O. T. as appearing and speaking in the *name*

The Unitarians, as they are bound to do by their system, strenuously contend, "that there is no evidence whatever to

and person of the Father. (*Script. Doct.* 3d ed. pp. 16. 109—112.) *Mr. Belsham*, indeed, goes more *directly* to work than the *Editors;* for he makes *Dr. Clarke* maintain the direct contrary of this doctrine, which in express terms and repeatedly that writer labours to establish. (*Calm Inq.* p. 213.) *Mr. Lindsey* had before done the same. (*Sequel*, &c., pp. 353, 354.) It is of great importance, in ascertaining the true character of these writers, to show how grossly they have misrepresented *Dr. Clarke.* I shall, therefore, beg the reader's particular attention to a few remarks on this head; especially, as they bear directly upon the present subject.

They quote *Dr. Clarke*, for the purpose of showing that they have *his* authority in saying that, from this passage of Isaiah, no argument can be drawn in favour of Christ's personal appearance in the time of the Prophets; for, that *Dr. Clarke*, like the Unitarians, but "understands the Evangelist as affirming, That the prophet saw, that is, *presaw*, the glory of Christ, as Abraham saw, i. e. *presaw* his day. John viii. 56." (See *Calm Inq.* p. 213.)—Now, to begin with the illustration, and to prove how far the *foreseeing* of Christ's *day* by Abraham, proves it to be *Dr. Clarke's* opinion, that *Christ* was not *seen* by Abraham, in the plain sense of the words, take *Dr. Clarke's* own expressions.—"Acts vii. 2. *The God of glory appeared unto our Father Abraham.*—Not that any man hath seen *the Father*, &c. But *God* appeared to Abraham *by Christ*, or *Christ* APPEARED to him in the *name and person*, in the *authority and representation* of the Father." (*Sacr. Doct.* p. 47, 3d ed.) Thus we may be satisfied how far *Dr. Clarke's* use of the phrase, of Abraham's *foreseeing* Christ's *day*, interfered with his belief that *Christ was personally seen by Abraham.* Whether the same writer, then, meant, in speaking of Isaiah's *foreseeing* the *glory of Christ's coming*, to intimate, that Christ did not *visibly appear*, and exhibit his *personal glory*, to the prophet, we may now reasonably judge.—But *Dr. Clarke* has not left the matter depending upon any inference however obvious. He follows up the very passage, which the Unitarians have quoted, with these words, on which those writers have taken care to be rigidly silent. "FURTHER;" (that is, in confirmation of the main point, which he had before meant to impress, in the very passage quoted by the *Editors;* namely, that Isaiah did, "when he saw the *glory* of *God the Father*," actually "*then* see the *Glory of Him*, who was to come in *the Glory of his Father*, i. e. that he *then* saw *the Glory of Christ himself:* in confirmation of this, I repeat, he says,)—"FURTHER; it is the constant doctrine of *all the primitive writers* of the Church, that *every appearance of God the Father* in the Old Testament, was *Christ* appearing *in the name or person of the Father* [ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ] *in the Form of God*, as being *the image of the invisible God*, Col. i. 15; of *Him* whom *no man hath seen at any time*, John i. 18," &c. We can now judge, whether *Dr. Clarke's* sentence has so happily conveyed the sense of the Unitarians, as they have assured us it has. Or, rather, we may now see, that they have *totally* and *knowingly* perverted its meaning, in order that they might impose on the unsuspecting reader their own corruptions of Scripture under a respectable name. The truth is, that *Dr. Clarke* conceived, and very justly, that his meaning could not be *mistaken* in the passage which the Editors have quoted. He had, before, on a variety of texts, so fully explained *every appearance of the glory of God*, as a *real appearance of Christ*, that he could not imagine that the se-

prove that Christ was personally concerned in any of the former dispensations of God to mankind, either to the pa-

cond sentence, in which he speaks of the prophet's being made to foresee the glory of Christ's *future coming*, could overturn what (according to that explanation so frequently repeated) he had distinctly laid down, in the first, concerning the vision which the prophet actually had of Christ's then *present glory*. And well, indeed, he might have imagined this. His meaning could not be, and it has not been, *mistaken*. That is not the charge to be brought against the Unitarian application of it. However, as justice must be done to all parties, I am compelled here to state, that in the *Animadversions by a Student*, (p. 84,) the accusation, advanced against the *Editors*, of having fabricated the second of the two sentences which they have quoted from *Dr. Clarke*, is entirely unfounded. They have quoted the passage fairly: but they have undoubtedly turned it to a most dishonest account.

I cannot avoid travelling a little farther with *Dr. Clarke*, since the Unitarians have brought us upon this ground. He quotes the following passage from *Bishop Bull*. "Wherever" (throughout the O. T.) "it was not a mere angel, but GOD HIMSELF, that appeared; there, according to the *unanimous opinion of all primitive antiquity*, we constantly affirm, that it was *not* THE FATHER, but THE SON." This position *Dr. Clarke* adopts, and proceeds to confirm. "Thus," (he adds,) "when it is said of Moses and the seventy Elders, Ex. xxiv. 10, that *they saw the God of Israel*, and that *there was under his feet as it were a paved work*, &c., it must be understood that they saw, not the Invisible Father, but THE SON, *appearing in the name and person of the Father*. All which is much confirmed by *St. Stephen's* expression, Acts vii. 30. 32, that *the Angel of the Lord* [viz. the *Angel of the Covenant, the Angel of his presence*, in whom *the name of God* was, and by whom God always speaks, upon which account he is styled, *ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the *Word of God*,] appeared to Moses in the Wilderness in a flame of fire in a bush;—saying, I AM *the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*," &c. (Ibid. pp. 111, 112.) In agreement with what is here affirmed by *Bishop Bull*, and *Dr. Clarke*, we have, accordingly, the multiplied testimonies of *the Fathers*. We have *Theophilus of Antioch*, saying, that it was the WORD OF GOD, that talked with Adam in Paradise, in *the person of God*. We have *Irenæus*, saying, that the WORD OF GOD did, in his divine and glorious character, converse with the patriarchs before Moses, and with those under the Law, &c.; and again, that the Scripture is full of the SON OF GOD appearing—to talk with Abraham—to instruct Noah—to seek Adam—to bring judgment on Sodom—to direct Jacob in the way—to converse with Moses in the Bush, &c. We have *Tertullian*, saying, that the WORD OF GOD, which is called HIS SON, appeared in divers manners to the Patriarchs IN THE NAME OF GOD, and *always spake to the prophets*. And, finally, not to tire the reader with a multitude of instances, we have *Cyril of Jerusalem*, saying, of the very passage in Isaiah, of which we have been treating, "The FATHER hath no man seen at any time; but HE, *which* THEN APPEARED *to the Prophet*, was THE SON." (*Catech.* 14.)—Now, when I tell the reader that THIS is one of the passages from the Fathers, which *Dr. Clarke* has cited for the purpose of confirming the justice of *his own* opinion, upon the text of Isaiah, he will surely be completely satisfied as to the fairness of the Unitarian critics, who have alleged *Dr. Clarke's* opinions and comment on *this* text, in support of *their* views of it, whereby they endeavour to

triarchs or to the Jews, but that the contrary is explicitly and repeatedly asserted in the Scriptures." (See *Calm Inq.* p. 458.) Agreeably to their usual mode of proceeding, then, it becomes necessary to disturb the true and natural meaning

overturn every thing which he has asserted and maintained. In examining this point, we have seen what is the *unanimous opinion of all primitive antiquity* (as *Bishop Bull* and *Dr. Clarke* express it) upon the subject of Christ's appearance in the times of the Old Testament. The Bishop, indeed, goes so far (and with *Dr. Clarke's* concurrence) as to affirm, that "all those appearances under the Old Testament, wherein the name *Jehovah* and divine honours are given to the person that appeared, (notwithstanding that perhaps he be only called an Angel,) are understood, by the FATHERS OF THE FIRST AGES, as belonging to the SON OF GOD; and that "HE THAT KNOWS NOT THIS, IS A STRANGER IN THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS." (*Scrip. Doctr.* pp. 121. 125.)

To put *Bishop Bull*, and *Dr. Clarke*, and *all antiquity*, to the blush, I shall here repeat what the *Calm Inquirer*, and his Unitarian fellow-labourers of the present day, *pronounce*, and of course from real knowledge of the subject:—"that there is *no evidence whatever* to prove, that Christ was personally concerned in any of the former dispensations of God to mankind, either to the patriarchs or to the Jews; but that *the contrary is explicitly and repeatedly asserted in* the Scriptures." Here is the whole of the case. Thus say the *Fathers*, and the whole Christian world on the one hand. And thus say the persons calling themselves *Unitarians*, on the other.—*Utrum horum mavis.*—One thing seems obviously to be inferred, that the latter do not use the *same Scriptures* with the former. That is precisely what the greater part of these volumes is intended to prove. The course which Unitarians have pursued is whimsical enough. The Received Scriptures, such as they have been transmitted from the Apostolic times, not giving support to their system, it was thought right, at one time, to try what could be collected from *the Fathers*, in favour of their object; and the writings of *the Fathers* were, accordingly, resorted to in place of Scripture, for the purpose of ascertaining certain doctrines to be the doctrines of Scripture, although they could not be found in the Scripture itself. *Mr. Lindsey's* attempts in this way were soon baffled by *Mr. Burgh* and others. An able disputant succeeded *Mr. Lindsey*, in the person of *Dr. Priestley*; who modelled the argument from the Fathers into what he conceived a less vulnerable shape. *Bishop Horsley*, however, proved, by the total discomfiture of *Dr. Priestley*, that this new mode of travelling to the doctrines of Scripture through the Fathers, (if new, indeed, that can be called, which is but an old Popish contrivance,) was as unfavourable to Unitarianism as the Scriptures themselves. A recent, but feeble attempt has, indeed, been made to recombine and replace some of the shattered arguments, which *Bishop Bull* had beaten down. But, by the learned *Bishop Burgess*, they have been again overwhelmed in their former confusion. The writings of *the Fathers* have, of course, fallen in the estimation of their Unitarian admirers; who now feel it rather a dangerous matter to appeal to their authority. But that they may not be thrown back again upon the Scripture, which had before proved ruinous to their cause, they have fashioned to their own purpose a manual which they *call* Scripture: and now they are fully prepared to set FATHERS, and APOSTLES, and EVANGELISTS, and PROPHETS, *all*, fairly at defiance.

of each individual text that offers this evidence; that so it may be pronounced, that no such evidence exists. And, in this view, the text before us unavoidably became a prominent object of their attention. Christ is, here, plainly spoken of, as existing, and exercising the functions of Deity, in the Jewish dispensation; and, therefore, the sense of this passage must be undermined, and at the same time *Newcome* must be *forgotten*. In addition to the reasons arising from the general subject of the passage, there is one part of the *Primate's* translation, that the Editors could not in consistency but reject—"HIM WHO WAS FROM HEAVEN:" this declaration of CHRIST'S *descent from heaven*, being directly subversive of all that they and their coadjutors have most anxiously laboured to establish. See pp. 117. 148—160, and especially 152, 153, of this volume: in which we have particularly noticed the extraordinary efforts of these Unitarian critics to escape [a] from the clear declarations of Scripture,

[a] Their mode of *escape* here is, as we have seen, by rendering the words τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, "him [God] speaking from heaven." Now, as we have found it quite a hopeless case to discuss with these critics the propriety of their translations, we have only to attend to the instruction which they are pleased to give us respecting their true import and application. In endeavouring, however, to discover the meaning which the *Editors* attach to their rendering of this clause, the reader, I apprehend, will find himself a little puzzled. For, as they inform us, God is here said to "speak from heaven by the gifts of the Holy Spirit:"—or, as *Mr. Belsham* (the principal Editor) expresses it, "by his" (God's) "Spirit:" (*Calm Inq.* p. 162.) or as it is in 1 Pet. i. 12, (to which the *Editors* refer us in their note,) "through the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven." As to *Mr. Lindsey*, to whom the note also directs us for the explanation of these words, he says not one word about the matter but simply recites the quotation from *Peirce*, to show, that it is not *Christ*, but *God*, that is the subject. But, as I have already said, this explanation of the *Editors* only puzzles the question. For, we are told in the very same page, that, "the *spirits* of men are men themselves;" and in page 541, that the *souls* of men, are the men themselves. *The Holy Spirit*, or the *Spirit of God*, must therefore in like manner be *God himself*. And so indeed we are distinctly informed at p. 447, and still more distinctly at p. 505. "The word *spirit* is a Hebraism to express a person's self:—the spirit of a man is a man himself: the *Spirit of God* is *God himself*."—There is, however, it must be noted, one exception to this *established* rule of interpretation, this *well-known Hebraism!* namely, the case of *Christ*. At the use of this word, all rules and idioms vanish. *The spirit of a man is a man himself: the Spirit of God is God himself:* but beware, here stops the *Hebraism: the spirit of Christ is not Christ himself;* FOR then, as *Mr. Lindsey* admits, we should have a plain proof of

—that our Lord came down from heaven, and that he descended from a divine state, to fulfil the objects of his

Christ's pre-existence, from 1 Pet. i. 10: and, therefore, the *Editors* inform us, on this passage, that *the spirit of Christ* is *the spirit which prophesied concerning Christ!* Well, then, God speaking from heaven by his Spirit, or by His Holy Spirit, is—*God himself* speaking from heaven: so that his speaking from heaven, actually means his speaking from heaven. This is plain enough, at all events. But, again, a great difficulty arises, as to the auxiliary passage, which speaks of this "Holy Spirit sent down from heaven;" because then, it remains to be explained how *God himself* has been sent down from heaven, and by whom he had been so sent down. Whether this be the precise point, that is said to have remained a difficulty to the "Angels," I know not: but certain it is, that to those "*messengers*" of whom the Editors speak in this verse, and who, they say, are meant by the word "Angels," it must indeed remain a difficulty. (*I. V.* p. 541.)

The jumble of *Angels, Spirits,* and *Heaven,* which is tossed about through the pages of the Unitarian Version, and of its principal annotator, the *Calm Inquirer,* is a thing altogether without example. There *are* ANGELS and there are *not* ANGELS DISEMBODIED SPIRITS are *admitted* and *denied.* There is *no* actual HEAVEN, and yet there *is* a HEAVEN spoken of as familiarly, as if its existence were believed in. *Mr. Belsham,* indeed, after having protested against the existence of *Angels* with all his might, has been brought by *Bishop Burgess* to confess, that he does not altogether give them up What, as he now says, he means to deny, is merely a *hierarchy* among them. HIERARCHIES! (odious word, the very sound of it provokes hostility!)—HIERARCHIES! are what he cannot admit, even among *Angels.* Allow him but a good bustling DEMOCRACY among the angelic tribes, and he is at once satisfied to concede the existence of as many of that order of Beings, as the most orthodox can desire. (*Review of the Brief Memorial,* pp. 105—107. 111.) However, after all, he cannot very easily discover the existence, any more than the hierarchy, of angels *in Scripture;* but he is led to the admission, not only of the *possibility,* but of the *fact,* from *philosophy.* —There is, indeed, it must be observed, an excellent reason why *Mr. B.,* as well as his brother *Editors,* should admit the existence of *Angels,* as "Beings of an order superior to mankind:" viz. that our Lord is pronounced, in Hebr. ii. 7. 9, to have been made *lower* than the angels. This single consideration has, I have no doubt, with Unitarians, preserved this order of beings from total extermination. But then, unfortunately, this same sacred Writer has, also, pronounced of our Lord, that he was *greater* than the angels, and that even the angels of God were to worship him. This matter, however, is thus easily explained to us by the *Editors*:—"This writer, having already proved, that Christ was *superior* to ANGELS, viz. to *all preceding prophets and messengers* from God, now proceeds to prove, that he is in his nature *inferior* to ANGELS, considered as *Beings of an order superior to mankind,* for that the nature of his commission required that he should be a proper human being. *It is no objection, that he uses the word Angel in a different sense without giving notice of the change. Such inaccuracies of style are not uncommon in the sacred writers!* (*I. V.* p. 505, and *Calm Inq.* p. 396.) Now, there is a comical hardihood in this last sentence, that puts every thing like gravity or seriousness to flight. The Apostle has used one and the same word Ἄγγελος, ANGEL, uniformly throughout. In honest simplicity the writer meant nothing different from what he said; and as he never dreamt

heavenly mission. It will also, from what has been laid down, in the passages there alluded to, not appear surprising

of any change in the use of the expression, so consequently he could give no notice of any. Oh! but says the Unitarian Editor, according to *my* hypothesis, *I* must, by the word "ANGEL," understand *prophet, wherever* Christ is said to be *superior to angels:* and, by the word "ANGEL" again, I *must* understand *angel, wherever* he is said to be *inferior to angels:* and, as to this change in the meaning of the word "ANGEL," the reader must not be at all surprised; FOR, this change, in which *I* have indulged, and with which the writer is in no way concerned, is but *an incorrectness of style not uncommon in —THE SACRED WRITERS!* Does the person who peruses this believe his eyes? and will he credit me, when I assure him, that the writers of this note exhibit no symptoms of openly laughing at their readers?

In truth, to show the monstrous and overwhelming absurdities into which the system of these writers unavoidably drags them, I would desire no more, than that the reader should carefully examine the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the *Imp. Vers.*, together with the notes; and the auxiliary remarks, in the 6th sect. of part first of the *Calm Inquiry*. If there be produced, in any other work now extant, an equal range of downright and irremediable nonsense, I am ready to admit the *I. V.* to be a fair version, and the *Calm Inquiry* to be a candid, sensible, and learned performance. In a word, what the *Calm Inquirer* and his brother Editors have given us upon this part of the N. T. is altogether too ludicrous for sober animadversion. What has been already bestowed upon their extravagances by *Bishop Burgess* and *Dr. Nares*, might be deemed so much of good criticism thrown away, if it were not, that there is no folly which there are not fools to embrace, if it be not contradicted. I shall notice but one single point, because it will help forward the due estimate to be formed of the knowledge possessed by the *Calm Inquirer*, and his brother Editors, of the original language of the book which they have ventured to translate. Ἐλαττόω they render (as they ought) to '*make lower.*' Ἠλαττώσας αὐτὸν, *thou madest him lower*. Then the passive of this verb, ἐλαττόομαι, they pronounce, is not properly to '*be made lower,*' but to '*be lower;*' and still more to *be so by nature*, so as to exclude all idea of any change wrought, or any act exerted. Τὸν δὲ ἠλαττωμένον, *him who* WAS *lower;* "not who was MADE, who WAS, *i. e.* by nature," *lower*. Thus, of the same person it is asserted, thou *madest* him lower, and yet that he was NOT *made* lower, but *was* lower by nature. An action is exerted upon a person, and yet this person is not the subject on which the action is exerted: but *is* naturally that, which he is said to be *made* to be. (See *I. V.* Hebr. ii. 7. 9. and *Calm Inq.* p. 397.) These transcendentals of grammar, which soar so far above the ordinary rules, will be better understood, when it is recollected, that they assist in overturning the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. But is it not disgusting to see such persons imposing on the unlearned, what they pretend to be an *Improved Version of the New Testament?*

As to the notions entertained by the Editors concerning *spirits*, it is not quite easy to determine: for, whilst they speak of the spirit of a man, as the man himself; and, where *spirits* in a separate state are manifestly intended, (as in Hebr. xii. 24,) carefully guard us against thinking of "*disembodied spirits:*" yet, in several parts of the N. T., in which spirits in a *separate* state are undoubtedly meant, they familiarly use the word *spirit*, as if they conformed to the usual acceptation. The *Calm Inquirer*, also, is similarly cau-

that the *Editors*, having here again departed from the *Primate* upon this *vital* subject, should here again be *profoundly*

tious upon this subject; and indeed, he affirms in his answer to the *Brief Memorial*, (p. 107,) that he has given no opinion of the nature of *spirits*. Whether he has formally done so, I shall not waste time to inquire: but, undoubtedly, his language at page 209 of his *Calm Inquiry* seems to convey something like an opinion against their separate existence. His known sentiments on *materialism*, also, may justify the supposition, that, when he affirms that "the word *Spirit* does not necessarily signify an *incorporeal* being," he only wishes to prepare the reader for the admission of the idea, that the word never can carry such a meaning. However, it seems but justice to this writer to make known the recantation which he has lately read on the subject of *materialism* itself. So far from being an AVOWED MATERIALIST, as he had been by all the world conceived to be, and as a friend of forty years' acquaintance and social intercourse has, within these few months, pronounced him to be, he now solemnly declares—what? that he does not himself know whether he is, or not. He cannot make out exactly, whether he is to rank with *Dr. Price* or *Dr. Priestley*. At length, however, he begins to apprehend that he should be placed somewhere *between* the two. That he should so easily give up *Dr. Priestley*, whose principle of *materialism* supplies, as he himself exults, (in his *Introductory Letter to Dr. Horsley*,) "a short and plain argument, conclusive against the doctrine of A SOUL, and consequently against the whole system of PRE-EXISTENCE," seems indeed surprising. Yet so it is. He cannot now concur with *Dr. Priestley*, nor yet with *Dr. Price*. He is *neither* MATERIALIST *nor* IMMATERIALIST; but finds himself at an intermediate point removed from both. He confesses, indeed, that he is "not *metaphysician* enough, to determine," where this point lies: and therefore he resorts to *Mathematics*, that he may avail himself of its clearness; and, by the aid of this science, he discovers his *true position* to be, in THE CENTRE OF OSCILLATION! This must, surely, satisfy the reader at once. His true position is hereby accurately ascertained. It only remains to solve the problem of finding this centre. But as the *figure* of the swinging body is necessary to determine this point scientifically, and the *time* of the swing to determine it mechanically, quære, has, *Mr. Belsham*, supplied sufficient data for the solution? But, in truth, there is abundant reason to pronounce that the *Calm Inquirer* is perfectly innocent of all knowledge of what this same *centre of oscillation* actually is. It is manifest that he has some confused notion of its being some *fixed* point between the extremes of oscillation; and not the least idea, that it occupies successively *every* point in the curve through which the body oscillates, including the extremes themselves. That the family of the *Botherims* in Morals and Metaphysics, (see p. 39 of this volume,) should be connected with that of the *Malaprops* in Mathematics, is not surprising. But to be serious, which, where this writer is concerned, is not always an easy matter, why will *Mr. Belsham* so often meddle with what he does not understand?—As an apology to such of my readers, as may impute to me a blameable levity, in some of the allusions in this note, I entreat their perusal of *Mr. Belsham's* letter, in the Number of the *Monthly Repository* for Dec. 1815; (Vol. x. p. 746;) by which, if I mistake not very much, the effect produced upon the muscles of the gravest will supply an excuse for that which, it is unnecessary for me to confess, has been produced on mine. The reader will there find, also, an attempt, on the part of *Mr.*

silent upon this departure. The suppression noticed under the head of Number III., has exactly the same bearing with that which has taken place here. Thus the *accidental* departures from *Newcome*, which are of course *unacknowledged*, fall wonderfully together, on the same important topic; and would certainly form a curious subject of calculation for a person competent to such inquiries, and disposed to exercise his skill in the *Doctrine of Chances*.

I have now, I trust, made good the charge, which, in a former edition, had been advanced against the Unitarian Editors, respecting their disingenuous use of the name of *Archbishop Newcome*[a]. For the charge, as it originally

Belsham, to run away from his avowed opinions on the *observance of the Lord's day*, as well as from those on the subject of *Materialism*. What he *has* said upon this subject he may, to be sure, formally retract: but, whilst he merely contends, that what he has said is *consistent* with the *Christian* observance of the day, the opinions generally attributed to him, and which are unavoidably deducible from his own statements referred to at p. 41 of this volume, will stick, like the poisoned shirt.—It would, indeed, be a matter of much satisfaction to observe the Unitarians thus anxiously disclaiming the irreligious and profane consequences of their system, which they formerly maintained with open triumph; were it not, as appears from this letter, and their other late publications, that this is done solely, *ad captum*, and to remove the impediments which such revolting avowals have thrown in the way of the *proselyting system* in which they have lately engaged.

[a] The views with which the Unitarians have selected the *Primate's* Version as the basis of theirs have, I apprehend, by this time been made sufficiently apparent. They indeed *profess* to have selected it on account of its general *accuracy*, *simplicity*, and *fidelity*, as well as its conformity to *Griesbach's* Greek text: their object being (as they tell us) to present to the public an *Improved Version* and a *Corrected Text*. How far these were their real views, will easily be collected, when it is considered, that in almost every passage of the N. T. in which the Unitarian theory is affected, these qualities of "*accuracy*, *simplicity*, and *fidelity*," are found to be wanting in the Primate, whilst they adhere to him in every other. In these parts, of course, he is deserted by the *Editors*: but in all others he is followed, indeed, with a "scrupulous fidelity," as the CALM INQUIRER expresses it: a *fidelity*, by which they evince their true object, as manifestly, as by their *desertion*; inasmuch as it equally tends to prove that, to render the version of the N. T. *more correct*, was not the end at which they aimed, but merely to *convert the Primate's translation to Unitarian purposes*. This inference we are unavoidably compelled to make, unless we can be brought to believe that the Primate is *always* correct, *save only* where the *Unitarian* question is involved. The *Editors*, it is true, might lead us to suppose that *they* are impressed with this belief; for, in all but the places here excepted, we find them following him to the utmost exactness, even in his *errors*; or, indeed, we may say, copying him right forward, without once pausing to see whether the Version

stood, I refer the reader to p. 75 of this volume: for the manner in which the Unitarians endeavour to repel it, I

agreed with the original or not. So that, in truth, one might be tempted to imagine that all that portion of the Primate's Version, which did not touch on the one important subject, was left to the mere printer's compositor, to set the type to as it stood; whilst the remaining part was reserved, only to undergo that revision of these learned *Editors*, which was necessary to CORRECT it INTO *Unitarianism*.

Whether this be an unlikely supposition, may be judged, when it is known, that even the ERRORS in the *printing* of the *Primate's* book are *exactly* copied into the IMPROVED *Version*; and the very mistakes, which the *Primate* has noticed, *in his list of Errata*, are carefully retained. Of the degree to which this negligence is carried, one example may be a sufficient proof. In Hebr. vii. 3, where it is said of Melchisedec, that he "resembling the Son of God, continueth A PRIEST perpetually," *μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς*, the *Primate*, (or his printer,) omitting, by mistake, the words marked in capitals, has it, "continueth perpetually:" and, accordingly, these *Editors*, who are looking only, as they tell us, after an IMPROVED *Version*, have it the same. Did they here follow the *Primate* implicitly, *neglecting the original?* Or, did they, after a careful attention to the original, fall, by mere mistake, into the *same error* with the *Primate?* Or did *their* printer make the *same* slip that *his* made? Here, again, the doctrine of chances puzzles us as much, about the agreement, as before we have found it frequently to do, about the departure. This, together with numerous other errors and alterations, the *Primate* has, indeed, noticed in a list at the end of his Book. But, as the *Editors* of the IMPROVED *Version* had not even taken the trouble to look to the end, until they came to it in the course of printing, the thing could not be remedied. The *Primate's list* could not, with any decency, be supplied at the conclusion; as this would be too barefaced an avowal of the total disregard of accuracy, and of the entire dependence upon *Newcome* to the neglect of the original, which accompanied them throughout *those parts of the work in which they felt no peculiar interest*. And, therefore, we really have, at this moment, independently of the perversions of Scripture in certain parts, a *less correct* translation of the N. T. in this IMPROVED *Version*, than we had before in that of *Newcome*, on which it professes to improve.

But, yet more, we have a part of that grand display of their learning and of their acquaintance with the sources of Biblical knowledge, which is exhibited by the *Editors* in their Introduction, copied almost verbatim from *Newcome*. This was *more* than they had promised. They had engaged, only, to follow his *translation*. But they had not engaged to deal out matter of Biblical instruction to their readers from the *Primate*. Yet they execute this, for which they did not contract, even more faithfully than the former for which they did. And, it must be said, they are as little ostentatious of their transcribing from the *Primate*, here, as they were, of their occasionally departing from him, there. They have, here, given all in their own name: and given honestly, as they found it, with all its errors and deficiencies, exactly as it stood in the *Primate's* Book. The effect, indeed, of this *fac-simile* procedure, is, in some respects, comical enough. By it, the INTRODUCTION has been actually converted into APPENDIX, from the accident of the word "APPENDIX" being prefixed to that part, at the *end* of the *Primate's* book, which has been copied by the *Editors* into the *beginning* of theirs.

But, yet farther, they have by the

refer him to pp. 112—116: whilst, in the pages from 116 to this, he will find examples and proofs in support of the allega-

same means arrived at the discovery of a NEW HERESY in early times; of which neither *Irenæus* nor *Epiphanius* among the ancients, nor *Ittigius* nor *Lardner* among the moderns, seem to have had the smallest idea: the *CORINTHIAN heresy!* They tell us, that St. John's Gospel was written, "to confute the *Corinthian* and other heresies." This, it will be apprehended, is a mere mistake for CERINTHIAN. And originally it was so undoubtedly. But, let it not be imagined, that the *Editors* of the *IMPROVED Version* could have fallen into any such mistake. They were too careful for that. They have copied it steadily from *Newcome;* in whose book, the word *Cerinthian*, used by *Dr. Owen*, has been so misprinted.

They have, likewise, in the list of lexicons useful for the New Testament, paid *Newcome* the compliment of adopting *his* list exactly: leaving out the *very* lexicon, to which they and their coadjutors constantly refer, as being decidedly of the highest authority, the Lexicon of *Schleusner*. It is true, it *is* of the value they have ascribed to it. But, then, it had not been named by *Newcome:* and although they make no *boast* of following the *Primate* in this part of their work, yet they could not prevail upon themselves to depart from him here in a single iota.

Again, as they have followed *Newcome* in a defective list of *Lexicons* for the N. T., so they have been led by him into an erroneous list of *Concordances* for the same. They are so *very* particular, as to mention the Concordance of "*ROBERT Stephens.* 1599." There is no such Concordanee. *Robert* Stephens died forty years before that date. The Concordance was by *Henry* Stephens. These being both authors of great celebrity, ought not to be confounded. The mistake, it is true indeed, is not great. But, coupled with the affectation of *precise knowledge,* (even to the use of the Christian name,) for the purpose of *accurate instruction* to the *less learned;* and being, after all, the plagiarism of a blunder, where originality is professed, and the airs of commanding acquaintance with the sources of Biblical information familiarly assumed, the thing is ridiculous in itself, and becomes just of so much consequence, as it is symptomatic of the nature of the work, and of the character of its authors. For the part to which these latter observations apply, see their Introduction, pp. xxxi, xxxii, and the greater part of p. xxxiii, to which I beg to direct the reader's particular attention.

Thus, we see, that the conduct of the *Editors,* with respect to their professed model *Newcome,* has, upon the whole, been either that of *slavish adherence,* or of *treacherous desertion.* We find the former, wherever there was no interest in the latter. But as to concern for the *truth,* or fidelity to the *original*—of these we can find no trace. Correctness and improvement form no part of the object. Adaptation to the purposes of a *party,* (it can scarcely be called a *sect,*) is the only thing held in view. *Newcome,* where these purposes cannot be served by deserting him, is servilely copied, (with all his errors,) to obtain his name, or to appropriate the fruits of his industry, and the credit of his learning. We have, in short, *Newcome's Testament moulded into Unitarianism;* that is, *emptied of CHRISTIANITY:* and this is the IMPROVED VERSION, whereby the Editors promise us a new era in Biblical knowledge.—Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo!

Indeed, the reason for adopting *Newcome's* version has been pretty plainly confessed, in a recent publication by one of the principal writers among the Unitarians, to have been of the description which has been contended for in this note, and elsewhere throughout

tion, selected from an ample and disgusting abundance. And if, whilst I have been employed in establishing this charge, evidence has arisen of artifice and dishonesty, not only in their application of the *Primate's* name, but in their treatment of other authorities, bearing on those parts of Scripture which vitally affect the Unitarian question: if, in their exposition of those parts of Scripture, numerous instances have appeared of falsehoods in quotation, of fallacies and blunders in reasoning, of rashness and ignorance in criticism, of confidence in assumption, of unblushing hardihood in assertion; in a word, of all the various means, and contrivances, by which bad faith, unchecked by learning, and unabashed by shame, is used to mislead the uninformed, and delude the unsuspecting; I trust, also, that I shall stand acquitted of improper severity, in the terms in which the charge was originally expressed; and that what the *Editors*, in the person of the CALM INQUIRER, (who is acknowledged as their

this Appendix. After stating, *of course*, that the Unitarians deemed the *Primate's* translation to be the best, he adds, as the important point,—"You cannot wound the Unitarians, but *through the sides of an eminent prelate of your own church.*" Here, indeed, we have a glimpse of the true state of the case. And to make the Unitarian Version appear, as much as possible (consistently with the real object) identified with the *Primate's*, all has been arranged in the manner which we have just described. No departures have been expended, but upon some point that would *tell*. The same writer has informed us, that "the *Improved Version* is only a *republication* of the work of *Archbishop Newcome*, with no variation in the text, but such as is sanctioned by the last corrected Greek text of *Griesbach*, and explained in the margin. The *paring*, *garbling*, and *mutilation*, therefore, of which you complain, is to be laid at the door of the *Archbishop* and *Griesbach*, who have *ventured* (audacious men!) to prefer truth to prejudice, and to set the interests of sacred literature above those of any particular church." (*A Plea for Unitarian Dissenters, by Robert Aspland*, p. 75.) Such is the latest account given of this matter, and by a writer who takes a distinguished lead in the direction of Unitarian concerns. We see, then, that now we are to consider the Unitarian Version as a *mere transcript of Newcome*, with a few improvements from the CORRECTED TEXT of GRIESBACH. The IMPROVED VERSION, therefore, is but the consolidation of *Newcome and Griesbach*. Of this, the reader is, by this time, qualified to judge, who has seen that both are constantly abandoned, when they fail to answer the *Unitarian purpose:* and that *Newcome*, especially, is frequently abandoned *dishonestly* and in *disguise:* contrary to what the same writer asserts of the "unnoticed variations between *Newcome* and the *Imp. Version*," (for he admits there are such,) namely, that they "are *accidental*, and neither *frequent* nor *important*."—But still the cry is, "You wound only an eminent Prelate of your own church."

advocate,) have complained of as *coarse language*, the reader will admit to be nothing more than the language of *plain truth;* and that he will be disposed to offer for me the apology, that Philip made for those, who are described as being in the habit of "calling a spade a spade."

Should this be the case, the exertions of the CALM INQUIRER, in vindication of the *Editors*, will but have served, like every effort of what is weak in defence of what is wrong, the more to expose what it was the object to conceal: and the extent of their obligations for his services, will amount to this,—that, from the closer inspection of the subject which he has provoked, stronger proof has appeared of *their* unfitness for the work which they had undertaken; and clearer manifestations have been made not only that what they profess to give as an Improved Version of the N. T. is calculated to remove from the mind every just idea of the original, but also that, in accomplishing this purpose, they have resorted to such expedients, that, if from *them* the religion of Unitarians is to be estimated, it may safely be pronounced to be any thing *but* the religion of TRUTH.

Having gone so fully into the subject of the first of the charges brought against the *Editors*, and into the important matter which it naturally drew into consideration, I am now compelled to touch with more brevity, than I had at first intended; though possibly, at the same time, bestowing more attention than is deserved upon the replies which have been made to the remaining charges by the advocates of the Unitarian Version.

To the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the former on the authority of the *Ebionites*, and the latter on that of *Marcion*, it had been objected, (see pp. 77, 78 of this volume,) that these early heretics stood convicted of the mutilation of the sacred canon: that, consequently, they were not credible witnesses as to its genuine contents: and that, therefore, the mere omission, in *their* copies, of any portion of Scripture, otherwise supported by credible testimony, could not affect its genuineness in the

least. On this principle, it was contended, that, whilst the genuineness of the chapters in question was attested by *all* the existing[a] Manuscripts and Versions, the alleged want of them in the respective copies of the *Ebionites* and *Marcion* could supply no ground whatever for their rejection.

Now, in answer to this reasoning, the arguments offered by the CALM INQUIRER, in defence of the *Editors*, possess at least an *originality* which entitles them to notice. One argument is, that these persons, against whom this charge of corrupting the Scriptures has been brought, *have themselves actually declared* their copies to be genuine[b]: and therefore

[a] I must here take the opportunity of correcting a mistake, committed by my learned friend *Dr. Hales*, at the 675th page of the 2d vol. of his *New Analysis*. He has, there, very truly remarked, that "the two introductions of Matthew's and Luke's Gospels are found in *all* the *unmutilated* Greek manuscripts extant; and in *all the versions* without exception." But, he has also said, that "the oldest Greek manuscripts, in uncials, or capital letters, the *Alexandrian*, *Cambridge*, *Parisian*, are imperfect, and want the two introductory chapters of *Matthew*." — Now this is not the case. The *Cambridge* and the *Parisian* both have them; with the exception, in the former, of the first 19 verses and part of the 20th, which however extends only a couple of verses beyond the genealogy; and even of this portion, only the first eleven verses can truly be said not to exist in the manuscript; because the first two folios only being lost, we have the Latin part of the codex, (it being Græc. Lat.,) so far back as the 12th verse. The truth is, that of the four manuscripts in uncials, of acknowledged and distinguished antiquity, the *Alexandrian*, the *Vatican*, the *Parisian*, and the *Cambridge*, the only one, in which (with the exception stated as to the *Camb. MS.*) any mutilation extends to the two introductory chapters of Matthew, is the *Alexandrian*, which is found imperfect so far as to the 6th verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel.—I have thought it right to be thus particular upon this point, lest the authority of so learned a writer as *Dr. Hales* should tend, in any degree, to diminish the strength of evidence supplied by the ancient MSS. to these introductory chapters of St. Matthew. That learned writer, the only object of whose incessant labours is the investigation of truth, is as desirous as I am myself that the above mistake should be corrected.

[b] At page 7 of the *Address*, &c., the reader will find that one of the circumstances on which the CALM INQUIRER principally relies for the credibility of the copies of the Ebionites, in opposition to all the existing manuscripts and versions of St. Matthew's Gospel, is, "that these Christians ASSERTED THEIR COPIES TO BE GENUINE." And again, at page 10, he tells us, that *Marcion's* "enemies accuse him of wilfully corrupting the sacred text; BUT HE DENIES THE CHARGE." Thus we see, that these early heretics had the honest candour to *confess* their copies to be genuine; even *although* these copies were precisely adapted to their peculiar opinions. — Such testimony who can reject, however resisted by the opposing testimony of thousands! I have here argued on the supposition, that these heretics made the declarations which this writer has ascribed to them. On this we shall see more hereafter.

genuine they must have been.—A second argument, equally ingenious and convincing is, that, the more they mutilated some parts of Scripture, the more anxious they would be to preserve the rest uncorrupted[a]: or, to put this in other words, the less honesty they had exercised on certain parts of the sacred canon, the more they would be sure to expend upon what remained:—a principle, involving a discovery in the rules of evidence touching the genuineness of written documents, for which the Courts of Law must hold themselves entirely indebted to the sagacity of the CALM INQUIRER.. —Before we proceed to any of the remaining arguments, it may be right to observe in this place, that none could be more natural for the chosen advocate of the *Editors* to employ, than those which we have just noticed. On the same principle with that of their *Ebionite* precursors, *they* are enabled to prove their English copy of the N. T. to be a sound and genuine representation of the original: for, like those ancient heretics, they too can produce, both their *affirmations* and their *mutilations*, in their support.

The third argument urged by the CALM INQUIRER has for

[a] "The *Ebionites*, we are told, rejected the three last Gospels, and all the Epistles of St. Paul. *It may be so.* THEN SURELY THEY WOULD BE THE MORE CAREFUL OF THAT GOSPEL WHICH THEY RETAINED." *Address*, &c., pp. 7, 8. On the same principle, also, we find the CALM INQUIRER contending, at p. 10, that *Marcion* would be THE MORE CAREFUL of the Gospel of St. Luke, as being the only one that *he* retained. But, with respect to the *Ebionites*, particularly, the CALM INQUIRER, with that partiality so natural in behalf of those to whom the Unitarians so fondly look as their prototypes, enlarges, with luxuriancy, as to the perfect state of their copies of St. Matthew. "This Gospel," he says, "which alone they acknowledged as authentic; this Gospel which they would *on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail*; this *purest copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew* wanted the TWO FIRST CHAPTERS." (*Address*, &c., p. 8.—This *purest* copy of Matthew's Gospel wanted THE WHOLE (observe) of the first two chapters. Well, what use do we find the CALM INQUIRER again turning this to? Why, to show, that the *Editors* are perfectly right in *not* rejecting *the whole* of these chapters; but in retaining a part of them; which, though wanting in this *purest* copy, (on which, of course, *implicit reliance* is to be placed,) was undoubtedly *a part of genuine Scripture*, which these honest *Ebionites*, who "would *on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail*" THIS Gospel, are *confessed* to have actually *cut out!* — I cannot expect the reader to credit me, in this statement of the reasonings of the *Editors*, and their CALM INQUIRER.—Let him compare what the CALM INQUIRER has said, with the *Editors'* own words in the first page of their translation.

its object to prove, that it is perfectly consistent with the principles of historic evidence, that a witness, convicted of falsehood in one part of his testimony, is not thereby rendered the less credible in another. The *Editors* had proceeded, upon the ground of the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel by the *Ebionites:* yet, finding it convenient to retain a *part* of those chapters, (which, as they conceived, favoured the notion of the mere humanity of Christ,) they did not scruple to reject the testimony of those very *Ebionites,* as to this part; and to admit, that, in this part of these two chapters, they had been guilty of mutilation; whilst, on the authority which had been thus discredited, it was still thought right to expunge the remainder of the chapters. On this, it seems not extraordinary to have adverted to the unreasonableness of "pronouncing the Ebionite witnesses, on one side of a leaf, as NOT CREDIBLE, *from their acknowledged mutilation of the sacred text,* and, upon the other side of the same leaf, maintaining them to be witnesses of such repute, as ought to be relied upon, in opposition to all the MSS. and all the Versions of the New Testament in the whole world." (See pp. 77, 78 of this volume.)

To reply to this observation the argument of the CALM INQUIRER is directed. But, as there is something puzzling in the matter, it has been deemed safest not to enter upon a direct and immediate solution, but to turn aside to a lively historical parallel, and then travel off briskly from the subject, by giving to the whole an agreeable and facetious termination. This ingenious writer, accordingly, after quoting the above passage, (that is, quoting it after the *Unitarian* fashion, —*cutting out the part of it on which the whole argument is made to turn*[a],) proceeds to observe:—"We should make

[a] The part here alluded to is the clause marked in italics in the last quotation. This clause, the reader will observe, formed the entire foundation of my argument. The *Editors* had contended for the fidelity of the report of the *Ebionites,* concerning the two introductory chapters of Matthew's Gospel; they had, at the same time, denied the fidelity of that report, by acknowledging the mutilation of these very chapters by those same *Ebionites.*

fine work of ancient history, if this *Dublin Professor's* principle is to be admitted, believe *all* or *none*[a], without discrimination. Livy relates that Hannibal crossed the Alps, and beat the Romans at the battle of Cannæ; and I believe him. The same Livy tells us that an *ox spoke;* but I believe him not. He asks then, "Is Livy to be pronounced on one side of the leaf to be credible, and on the other incredible?" and so goes on, to make himself exceedingly merry[b], at the expense of the *Dublin Professor;* who would,

In this view of the case, it was demanded, whether the *Editors* would thus reject the *Ebionites* as *not credible*, admitting them to be convicted of the mutilation of these chapters, and yet contend for them, in attestation *of these same chapters, as credible* witnesses, whose authority no counter testimony was sufficient to impeach. Yes, says the CALM INQUIRER, I *do* believe the *Ebionites;* and I do *not* believe them: for, (having first imitated the *Ebionites* by cutting out the part of the passage which hampered him, and having thereby shaped, or endeavoured to shape it, to his own purpose,) "in the one case I see reason to concur with them, and in the other to differ from them;" and then, he passes on to the two distinct facts of the Battle of Cannæ and the speaking of the ox, as an exact representation of the case of the *Ebionites*, being supposed at the same time capable and incapable of mutilating the Gospel of St. Matthew; at the same time credible and incredible, respecting the genuineness of the first two chapters of that Gospel. It is a curious, but not an inexplicable, fact, that the spirit of mutilation has been in all ages a character of Unitarianism. Take the *old* EBIONITES, or the *new;* it is still the same.

[a] The *Dublin Professor* carries his principle even farther than "*believe* all or none." He is so whimsical as to require of those, with whom he is engaged in discussion, to *quote all or none*, of any passage, which they profess to give as his. But here the Unitarians contend for unrestrained liberty, as before. They proceed "*with discrimination*" here likewise; and as they believe and disbelieve just what they think proper, so, (as we have seen in the last note, and in other similar instances without number,) they select and reject from any sentence, which they profess to quote, just what they find convenient. It answers the present turn; and satisfies the literary fame, that hopes not to exist beyond the *pamphlet*.

[b] There is a *certain* merriment, which the wise writer of Ecclesiastes has compared to "the crackling of thorns." It is for the CALM INQUIRER to consider, whether his laughter be of *this* description.—Could it have been imagined, that the Unitarians would have put forward the dullest of their tribe in their vindication? Yet so it is. Here we find not only an utter incapacity to understand a plain argument, but a merry-making in the display of dulness, which, though ludicrous enough to lead the mind from the *speaking of the ox*, its favourite topic in this place, to the braying of an inferior animal, yet, when properly considered, can only move compassion. The severities of this writer, also, are of the same family with his jocularities. The author of the *Discourses on Atonement and Sacrifice* must, surely, feel himself deeply wounded, by being reminded, as he is in every second page of this performance, that he is a "DUBLIN PROFESSOR," an "IRISH THEOLOGIAN;" and, of course,

he says, on *his* principle, be "unable to believe the battle of Cannæ, without believing likewise that the ox spoke:" but,

debarred from breathing that purer intellectual atmosphere, which has been the happier lot, and readily accounts for the higher endowments, of the CALM INQUIRER and his associates. *Whatever* neatness of invective there may be in this, is accompanied with a *like* delicacy of insinuation, equally indicative of the refinement of the writer. "*Silly conclusions*," "*silly observations*," and "*nonsense*," are some of those remote and gently touched forms of expression, which enable the writer to make a deep incision, whilst he scarcely seems to intend a wound. See pp. 7, 8, 9, 10. 12, 13. 17, 18, 19. 24. of the *Address*, &c. The Author, indeed, we find, deals in such daintily enfolded satire as the above, not less from policy than from taste. For he openly expresses himself as habitually aware, that "coarse and vulgar language is no advantage to any cause:" and he adds, that "UNITARIANS *disdain* to descend to it; and that if their principles cannot stand without it, they are content that they should fall." (p. 5.) It is to be presumed that the highly classical and liberal forms of education, and habits of society, in which *Unitarians* are generally trained up in their Academies, have produced this elevation and urbanity which the author claims for his brethren; and which are so abundantly displayed in their writings, even where it might be supposed that the literæ humaniores would have given way before the ardour of controversy.

Thus *Mr. Belsham*, who is eminent in this line, beautifully describes, in his *Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley*, the "temerity" of that gentleman, by his "running A MUCK at all he meets." (*Monthly Repository*, vol. viii. p. 454.) With like elegance, he represents *Bishop Horsley* (ibid. p. 176) as possessing "a BOW-WOW manner:" and (p. 244) denominates any person, "who should seriously profess to believe" that the *Bishop* had the advantage in the argument with *Dr. Priestley*, "A SOLEMN IGNORAMUS." This last, indeed, Mr. Belsham conceives to be a peculiarly happy flight. He returns to it, after an interval of two years; as may be seen in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. viii. N.S. p. 322; in which, although, from his benevolence, he is *harassed with fears*, lest this potent phrase should "disturb the rest, and haunt the dreams" of the learned successor of *Dr. Horsley;* yet, from his good taste, and self-complacency, as the author of so singularly pointed and beautiful an expression, he *exults* in the thought, that "*this goading remark*" "*clings to his Lordship's soul;*" and that "*this* BUSINESS OF THE 'SOLEMN IGNORAMUS' *twines about his heart-strings*," so that "*he cannot get over it*," &c. The numberless finely turned compliments which this writer has paid, on many occasions, to the *Clergy of the Established Church*, are instances of the same delicate description. These exercises of refined taste, indeed, this author luxuriates in to such a degree, that they are to be found almost in every page of his writings. A few other specimens have been already adduced at pp. 45—47 of this volume. Nor are these flowers of fragrant rhetoric reserved for persons:—they are sometimes made to spread their perfume over things.

Thus in his answer to *Bishop Burgess's Brief Memorial*, in speaking of 1 John v. 7, he says, (p. 179,) "the *notorious* text of the heavenly witnesses has been so long dead and buried, that '*by this time it stinketh:*' nor will all the labour and learning of the *pious* prelate, even though it should be aided by all the professional skill and experience of the *Humane Society*, ever be able to bring it back to life." Some have thought, that the gravity of Scripture language gives a seasoning to wit.

at the same time, he comforts himself with the reflection, that *he* lives on *that* "side of the water," in which, "a little

It will be remembered, that the reference here, is to the raising of Lazarus to life by our BLESSED SAVIOUR. And *the joke* consists in an allusion to *this action of our Lord;* whilst a diverting picture is held up of the prelate at the head of the whole Humane Society, labouring in vain to restore a dead text to life: and the *piety* of the *well intending* Bishop is made to bestow an additional pleasantry upon the whole.

Mr. Belsham, Mr. Gilchrist, and other such polished writers of the Unitarian school, have quite a felicity in this way. Does not the latter gentleman, however, *affect,* occasionally, to depart *somewhat* from these delicacies, when he says that, in reasoning with the Trinitarian, he "feels as if he were brought upon the stage, to fight with wild beasts, or to contend with madmen;" and again, that, as to the argument drawn from Christ's being the *only begotten Son of God,*—"the man, who, in the nineteenth century, can say, that Deity has generated Deity, is fitter to be driven to the fold, or locked up in a madhouse, than reasoned with;" and again, when he speaks of "mongrels and monsters," as descriptive of the *Trinity* and the *twofold nature of Christ;* and when he exclaims against the "mystical monks and feeble-minded, narrow-souled priests," who hold those doctrines? And does he not offer some degree of violence to the delicacy and taste, which his habits of association must have produced, when he pretends to say, "*We* prefer 'clearness and aptness to neatness and politeness, and fetch comparisons from the stable or the scullery, when none occur suitable to our purpose in the parlour or the drawing room;'" and when he professes to exult, "that when our immortal authors wrote," (such as "*Shakspeare, Bacon, Taylor,* and *Barrow,*") "such a thing as *taste,* and its *principles, laws,* and *rules,* (*which are ever found to flourish most in barren ground,*) were not *even heard of;* a century or two after, come *creeping into existence a feeble finical race of dancing masters and epicures, mawkishly puling about taste, as if they had no receptacle but their stomach,* and *no standard of excellence but their palate?*"—Surely this polished writer has permitted his *early* acquaintance with *Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Longinus,* and the other great masters of antiquity, to carry him to a degree of fastidiousness somewhat too severe against rhetoricians of later times.—N.B. This gentleman is one of the *chosen* champions of Unitarianism, *appointed to preach on stated days and subjects* (*publicly advertised*) at the Unitarian meeting-house in Finsbury Square.—The finished composition, from which I have given these few specimens of his happiest manner, is a Discourse delivered by this Unitarian preacher at Southampton in 1814.—But I must not allow this attractive subject to detain me too long. I cannot, however, forbear adding, for the information of all those interested in the progress of just composition as well as of etymological research, that I learn from a sketch fresh from the press, which has just now met my eye, that this vigorous and elegant writer intends to devote his *uncommon* powers to the promotion of these objects. He professes himself altogether disgusted with *Mr. Dugald Stewart,* as "a finical rhetorician, a quibbling metaphysician"—who "is as ignorant of words as of notions, and of notions as of words"—and "as purblind in metaphysics as in philology." And he declares his grand object in engaging in etymological studies to be, that they may produce an "effect on such misty, vacuous compositions as those of Professor Stewart, similar to that of electric concussions on stagnant vapours." The horizon of language being completely cleared from the fogs

common sense is exercised in judging of a report, and in discriminating what is worthy of belief from what appears to be incredible in the works of the same author."[a] (*Address*, &c., pp. 8, 9.)

of such writers as Professor Stewart, we are then to have, by the bright reflection of "words," which this gentleman says are the "mirrors of ideas," such luminous views of all that relates to the science and metaphysics of language, as will give us the full benefit of an unclouded meridian sun. Thus, we see, that, from the splendid orb of Unitarianism, floods of light are now to break in upon us in all directions.—From the united efforts of these two great Metaphysicians and finished writers of the Unitarian school, *Mr. Belsham* and *Mr. Gilchrist*, it is plain, that Professor Stewart cannot be expected any longer to stand his ground. That he should have been made a special object by these Unitarian metaphysicians and rhetoricians, is not surprising, when it is considered that his writings possess properties in every respect different from those that belong to theirs; and, in addition to this, when *Mr. Gilchrist* has discovered him to be a "BIGOTED PERSECUTOR."—Now that Mr. Stewart has been thus convicted as a pitiful composer, an ignorant metaphysician, and a *bigoted persecutor*, it is time that real masters, like *Mr. Gilchrist* and *Mr. Belsham*, should take his place.—The reader will receive some amusement from a paper on PHILOSOPHICAL ETYMOLOGY in the *Monthly Magazine* of Feb. 1, 1816.

[a] *Dr. Wardlaw*, who treats whatever he handles with singular clearness and good sense, observes on this passage, coupled with the distinction just before quoted from this writer respecting what is credible and incredible in *Livy*,—"Very well. We have no objection to his saying, provided he does not insist that *our* faith shall be regulated by *his*, 'The Evangelist Matthew relates, that Jesus of Nazareth died on a cross; and I believe him. The same Evangelist Matthew relates, that Jesus of Nazareth was born of a virgin; but I believe him not.'—Let this writer, by all means, 'exercise a little common sense in judging of a report, and in discriminating'—(&c. as above quoted.) But let him not, wherever he finds any thing which *he* may be pleased to deem incredible, unwarrantably and presumptuously conclude that *it forms no part of what the author wrote*."—(*Discourses*, &c., p. 433.) The same sensible and serious author properly remarks upon "the levity, and impiety, of the comparison" devised by the CALM INQUIRER.—That the *speaking of the ox* has been chosen as a parallel to the history of our *Lord's Incarnation*, is, undoubtedly, in perfect correspondence with the degree of respect which this writer shows, throughout, for sacred subjects. His choice of this subject of allusion might lead one to suppose that from the same pen had lately issued another production upon the credibility of the *Incarnation*, in which the *ox* is likewise made an object of comparison and a topic of illustration. Shocking as is the subject-matter of this publication, yet, for reasons sufficiently obvious, I shall here give a sketch of its general outline, suppressing however the most disgusting particulars. The writer, having described the worship of the golden calf at Horeb as an act of blasphemous idolatry, and having supposed the Israelites to have passed from this species of worship to that of the fabulous god Apis, under the idea, that the God of Israel had, in the womb of a cow, taken upon him the bovine nature, and thus become incarnate, in the form of an *ox*, whilst at the same time still in heaven,—he asks, whether this worship

Most assuredly, if such reasoning were supposed to be characteristic of the side of the water to which this CALM INQUIRER belongs, neither side will be very ambitious to claim him as its property. The Homeric contest must here be but little to be apprehended. For, in the same compass of *reasoning*, so rich a complication of blundering has seldom been concentred. The two cases, confounded together as similar, are, manifestly, at direct variance, in *every* point of comparison. The testimony of the *Ebionites* relates, 1. to *one* fact; the faithfulness of the transcript of a certain written record: 2. it is assumed to speak of this transcript from actual knowledge: and, 3. it pronounces upon the whole of the transcript with equal positiveness throughout.—The tes-

would not have been at least as blasphemous as the other? And if so, he contends, it must be equally blasphemous to admit the doctrine of the Incarnation, as contained in the N. T., since the nature of the animal, through which the Divine Being became Incarnate, can make no difference whatever. He then demands whether, if it shall appear that the Emperor Constantine, and almost all who have succeeded him in the possession of civil power in Europe, have *abused their temporal authority, to the purpose of enforcing upon their subjects the doctrine of such an incarnation of the Deity*, we shall not be forced to confess, that they have indeed "opened their mouths in BLASPHEMY against God?" In this strain, the writer continues, at considerable length, to revile, and brand with the charge of *blasphemy*, all who receive the Scripture doctrine of the *Incarnation*. This publication, let it be observed, followed close upon the repeal of the *Law against Blasphemy*; and may be considered as some of the *first fruits* of that *Repeal*. Thus, we see, the tables are now completely turned. The *Government* is now charged with that *blasphemy*, which it has ceased to denounce. And thus, whilst an *ideal* restraint upon liberty has been removed; a restraint, which operated, simply, to prevent such outrages as this upon decency, and, as it might ultimately prove, upon the essential peace and well-being of the community, a licence has been given to vilify the religion of the land, to bring its governing authorities into disrepute, and to give confidence and audacity to those turbulent spirits, who, through the downfall of religion, would work the destruction of the state. This is not the only instance in which this licence has been similarly exercised.—But to return.—The *bovine* allusion is, here, we find, and on a corresponding subject, as familiar, as it is to the CALM INQUIRER. So that we might be tempted to pronounce the anonymous writer in both cases to be the same, did we not find the signature *B.* annexed to the publication in question: which signature (although *Dr. Wardlaw* and *Dr. Nares* pronounce it to be the *initial* of the person who has assumed the title of the CALM INQUIRER, and although a writer, of this initial, does assume this title familiarly in almost all his publications, see particularly his *Claims of Dr. Priestley*,—yet) we have no right to affirm, *must* belong to the CALM INQUIRER.

timony of the Historian, on the contrary, relates, 1. to *two* facts, distinct and unconnected: 2. it refers but to the reports of these facts derived from others: and, 3. it speaks of these facts in terms widely different, as to the credit attached to them by the Historian. Yet, the advocate of the Unitarians sees these two cases so completely identified, that, if Livy's report of the one fact can reasonably be deemed credible, whilst his report of the other is considered to be incredible, it follows, he thinks, of necessary consequence, that the *Ebionites* may, at the same time, be received as credible, and rejected as incredible, respecting different parts of the transcript, the fidelity of the whole of which they attest.

But the grand parent blunder of all consists in the confounding the *genuineness of the record* with the *truth of the facts* recorded. If, indeed, this CALM INQUIRER had, in this happy comparison between *Livy* and the *Ebionites*, pronounced, that, as he could not believe that the *ox spoke*, therefore the part of *Livy's* history, which contained the report of that fact, could not be genuine, he would then have said something which bore upon the question: or, if, instead of relating the two facts of the *battle of Cannæ* and the *speaking of the ox*, *Livy* had professed to have given both these relations, as a transcript from *Fabius Pictor*, or some other ancient historian, and that it could be proved with respect to the latter of the two, that he had falsified as to its being a part of the ancient document, whilst it remained to be inferred from his authority, whether the former were contained in it or not; our critic would, indeed, have a case parallel to the one in question, whatever might be the fruits of the similitude: but, by an extraordinary confusion of brain, (instanced very frequently, in writings, bearing the same signature with this Unitarian pamphlet,) matters totally dissonant are blended together as one: and as in the example of the blind man reasoning upon objects of sight, the nature of scarlet colour is deduced from the sound of a trumpet.

However, had this writer been able to arrive at his own

meaning, he would have found it to be this, which may be discovered moving in a confused and muddy stream through all that he has said:—that the reason why he and the *Editors* believe the *Ebionites* when they reject that part of the first two chapters of St. Matthew which contains the account of the miraculous conception, and do not believe them when they reject the part which contains the genealogy, is, that they cannot admit the story of the miraculous conception, which wars with their system, to be credible; whilst the account of the genealogy, which they conceive to accord with that system, they have no objection to believe. That is, in truth, they determine what is genuine in Scripture, and what is not, by its accordance and repugnance to their system; whilst they profess to derive their system from what is genuine in Scripture. This is the true logic of *Hackney*[a]: a happy specimen of the

[a] For a complete system of the *Logic of Hackney*, combined with a treatise of *Metaphysics*, worthy of sharing the same fortunes under the same cover, the reader may recollect that I have already referred him, at p. 61 of this volume, to a work entitled *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, &c.—a work possessing nothing but the name in common with the production of an elegant and acute Metaphysician now living. Why the *Socinian* of *Hackney* should have chosen this title, already appropriated, it is hard to say. It could not be to *mark* contrast. Could it be to filch a credit from homonymous association? But, be it as it may in this respect, it contains a Logic, and a Metaphysic, for the use of Unitarians, which is worthy of no other cause. Many specimens of their application have been exhibited in these sheets; and, especially, at pp. 61—63 of this volume, some of the actual contents have been drawn out, for the edification of the reader. A late publication, by the Author of the *Elements*, in which he adverts to that work, induces me to direct the reader's attention to it once more.

In his *Claims of Dr. Priestley*, p. 11, he quotes the following passage from the *Rev. H. Horsley*:—"I have been told, by a learned friend of mine, much conversant in works on the laws of reasoning, that Mr. B. published, some years ago, a Compendium of Logic, remarkable for such *definitions* as the world had never before seen." [Some *definitions*, to which such a character would fairly apply, the reader has seen at the pages which I have above referred to.]—Now, what is Mr. Belsham's observation, in answer to this?—"It should seem that the reverend Prebendary's *learned friend* was not very deeply conversant with the works of *Locke, from which the* DOCTRINE *of definition in the Compendium is taken.*" Now, is it too much to say, that the Author, who gave *such* an answer, is incapable of framing a *definition*, if *precision* be of its essence? What has the Rev. Prebendary said?—That *Mr. B.'s* Compendium contained *definitions* of an extraordinary nature. No such thing, says *Mr. B.*, for my *doctrine* of definition (of which the learned Prebendary had said not one word) is taken from *Locke.* — *Ex pede Herculem.* — The

circulating syllogism, with which the writings of Unitarians abound. Part of these chapters is not genuine, because its contents are not credible, and the contents of that part are not credible, because it is not genuine[a]. To be

reader may easily judge of the Compendium, and of its *definitions*.

But, to mend the matter,—taking up even this DOCTRINE *of definition*, which *Mr. B.* deems his palladium, so far is it from being *taken from Locke*, that *Mr. Locke*, were he alive, would not acknowledge *one sentence of it* from the beginning to the end. And, what is whimsical enough, in the unfolding of this very *doctrine of definition*, (which is, in truth, but a caricature of *any* intelligible doctrine upon the subject,) this writer has indulged (by way of example of what *definition* ought to be) in some *definitions* of that very description to which the Rev. Prebendary had alluded.—Will the reader believe, that his definition of "*creature*," combined with that of "*substance*," represents the former to be, "DERIVED BEING SELF-SUBSISTING;" and that his definition of a *square* is "a FOUR-sided figure, having FOUR equal sides and FOUR right angles?" The *species of Being*, to which "*creature*," is synonymous, is here, undoubtedly, *more fully* opened up than by any other writer. And the *fact* of the *four-sided* figure called *a square* having actually FOUR *sides* and FOUR *angles* is better enforced from the repetition, than in the meagre definition given of it by *Euclid;* which merely pronounces, of this species of *four-sided figure*, that it "has its *sides equal*, and its *angles right*:"—ἰσόπλευρόν τε ἐστι καὶ ὀρθογώνιον. How the richness and amplification of the modern English Mathematician shine forth, when contrasted with the parsimony of the superannuated Greek! Some, indeed, may affect to complain that the *Laws of Definition* (which, by the by, the Author forgot to notice in this complete *doctrine* of definition *taken from Locke*) have not been, here, very minutely observed: and that the *first* of these two definitions would have been *somewhat* improved by attending to *one* of those laws (Definitio debet esse clara), and the *second* by attending to the *other* (Definitio debet esse adæquata). But the *Author* answers all such cavils, by saying, that his *definitions* cannot be wrong, because he has taken the *doctrine* of definition from Locke, (whom, in truth, he has not despoiled of an atom of his property on that subject,)—and *I* answer, that the reader need not quarrel with him for such *trifles*. Let him but read the chapter itself: and then —— For my own part I view these *Elements*, altogether, as a truly wonderful performance. I never return to them, but with fresh admiration. —When to these *Elements* of *Mr. Belsham*, the philological lucubrations of his brother Unitarian, and congenial fellow-labourer, MR. GILCHRIST, have been superadded, then, indeed, the human understanding will have received such aid, that, not only the Logics and Metaphysics of *Mr. Dugald Stewart* and other moderns may be safely dismissed, but the *Novum Organum* itself (it is to be supposed) will be superseded.

[a] Of the *Hackney Logic*, there is another excellent specimen, connected with this subject. It is one, which opens with the first exercise of the critical powers of the *Editors*, and even with the first line of their first note in the *Imp. Version*. It is neither more nor less, than their *concluding* in *necessary matter*, from a *probable premiss*. It is *probable*, they say, that the genealogy is genuine, and was found in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. But the story of the miraculous conception *could not* (they add) have been written by the author of the genealogy. *Therefore*, they conclude, the story of the

called upon to establish either the spuriousness of the record, or the falsehood of the contents *separately*, is deemed to be unreasonable and captious.

miraculous conception *must have been* wanting in the copies above named: for if the genealogy be genuine, the story must be spurious. Thus we see, that because the genealogy *probably* is genuine, the story of the miraculous conception, *necessarily* is spurious! and upon REASONING (am I to call it?) such as this, an important portion of Scripture, supported by every existing manuscript and version, is at once swept away. Let Unitarians, who have been weak enough to take these *Editors* as the guides of their belief in what is true Scripture, see on what intellects they build their faith: and let them recollect, what true Scripture has pronounced to be, not the *probable* but *certain* issue, when *the blind lead the blind.*

But, independently of this jump from the PROBABLE to the NECESSARY, we have a slight difference with these Dialecticians, upon the matter of the *vis consequentiæ* also; which they assume a little too hastily; and which a word or two will be sufficient to rescue from their grasp. "IF the genealogy be genuine, this narrative" (viz. of the miraculous conception) "MUST BE spurious."—Why so? Because *this narrative* "COULD NOT have been written by the author of the *genealogy;* for it *contradicts his design,* which was to prove that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David; whereas the design of this narrative is to show that Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, was not his real father." The same argument is repeated by the CALM INQUIRER (page 12 of the *Address,* &c.) in his defence of the *Editors.* Now, both the *Editors* and their vindicator may be perfectly at ease, as to the difficulty which the author of the genealogy would have to combat in reciting the narrative of the miraculous conception: for if, as they inform us, this difficulty was to be occasioned, only by the circumstance of the *design of the narrative* being to show that Joseph was *not* the *real* father of Jesus, this could raise no very great impediment in the way of him who asserts *this very thing* in his account of the *genealogy.* For what does the *genealogy* say? "Abraham *begat* Isaac," "Isaac *begat* Jacob,"—and so on, for about forty generations, using the word ἐγέννησε, *begat,* in each instance; until, in the 16th verse, the whole closes, with telling us, that "Jacob *begat* Joseph;" and what next?—that Joseph *begat* Jesus? No: no such thing. The uniform course is here at once broken:—"Jacob begat Joseph, *the husband of Mary:* OF WHOM" (Mary) "WAS BORN Jesus, who is called Christ."—Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσὴφ, τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, Ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. Now is it possible to declare, in plainer terms, that, though Jesus was born of Mary, who was married to Joseph, yet that Joseph *did not beget* him? [See *particularly Rosenmüller* on Matth. i. 17, page 16.] And is not this precisely what the *narrative of the miraculous conception,* in the same Evangelist, relates at length? We see, then, that a part of "the design of the genealogy" is precisely that which the *Editors* say was "the design of the narrative;" namely, "to show that Joseph, the *reputed* father of Jesus, was not his real father." [1]And, in like manner, we are told this exactly in St. Luke's reference to the same subject; that Evangelist, when he speaks of Jesus, as the son of Joseph, using these remarkable words, "Being, AS WAS SUPPOSED, the son of Joseph: *i. e.* being his *reputed*

[1] See *Whitby's* Preface, p. vii.

The same course is pursued with respect to *Marcion*, which has been pursued with regard to the *Ebionites*. The CALM INQUIRER contends for the right of the *Editors* to believe and to disbelieve, of what *he* attests, just what they may choose, pronouncing him credible and incredible at pleasure:

son only, but *not* his son *in reality*. [N.B. the attempt of the *Editors* to get rid of this, by construing ὡς ἐνομίζετο, "as was allowed by law," is quite pitiable. Even if the translation *could* be justified, it would still be an admission, that he was but the *reputed* son, *allowed as such* by the law.] "Josephi filius NON ERAT, sed VULGO PUTABATUR,"—"He was NOT the son of Joseph, but only VULGARLY REPUTED TO BE SO,"—are the words of *Grotius*, in explaining this part of St. Luke. This favourite author the *Editors* had quoted on the words immediately preceding ὡς ἐνομίζετο, but thought it not convenient to travel forward the next step, and quote him upon these. Another favourite author they have also declined quoting, on the subject of the genealogy as given in Matthew; namely, *Lardner*, who affirms of the *Cerinthians*, that, "if they received the genealogy in Matthew, they *must allow* that Jesus was born of a virgin." *Works*, vol. ix. p. 326. This, it will be remembered, is the opinion of a decided Unitarian. Again, what is to be said of their greatest favourites of all, the *Ebionites?* Is it to be supposed, that they would have *cut out* the genealogy from the very gospel which they used (which is what the *Editors* affirm of them) if the design of the genealogy included that which the *Ebionites* were most anxious to establish; namely, the proof, that Joseph was the real father of Jesus? May we not rather suspect, that they found the genealogy so unfavourable to this result, that they thought it prudent to expunge it from their gospel?

To sum up now the substance of this note.—The *Editors*, and their *Calm Inquirer*, have said: It is *probable* that the genealogy is genuine; *therefore* the narrative of the miraculous conception which contradicts its design *must* be spurious. I answer. The *probability* of the former could not induce the *necessity* of the latter, even *if* there were a contradiction. But there being, in place of a contradiction, a marked *conformity*, between the *genealogy* and the *narrative*, the genuineness of either tends to *confirm* that of the other.—Thus then, we see, Scripture is swept away not merely for reasons not sufficient, but for reasons that should establish it.

That I might not encumber the subject, I made mention, at the beginning of this note, of but *one* probability. But, in reality, the *Editors* have grounded their argument upon two, the one engrafted upon the other. The gospel of the *Ebionites*, they say, was *probably* the original gospel of Matthew written in the Hebrew, for the Jewish believers. This is *one probability* (or rather an aggregate of probabilities). Then, again, it is *probable*, that this original gospel, &c., contained the genealogy. This is a *second probability* raised upon the shoulders of the former: or rather, they should have been reversed, and the other raised upon the shoulders of this. But it is the same in the end. From one hypothesis built upon another: from a probability growing upon a probability; a *certainty* is the result.—This translated into mathematical language, would make the product of two proper fractions (which must be a smaller fraction than either) equal to an integer;—a mathematical result, equally worthy of Hackney *with* the logical one, that would make the *chance* OF *a chance* amount to CERTAINTY.

and, with the conduct of the *Dublin Professor*, who is so unreasonable, as to contend, that this *Marcion* should *either* be considered as a credible witness, *or* as one not credible, but not *both* at the same time, he contrasts his own great candour and that of the Unitarians; who, he says, would actually believe *Athanasius* himself, "the great Athanasius," IF he bore *testimony in favour of the Unitarian side of the question*. (This *is* candour[a].) He then proceeds in full triumph, to condemn, as before, the *Dublin Professor* for "applying his *new* principle of believe *all* or *none* to the testimony of Marcion; or, as he otherwise expresses it, for "not being content, unless all be believed in the *lump;*" unless people "believe or disbelieve in the *gross*." And he concludes the subject, in the same spirit of candour and good sense which had governed him throughout, by remarking, that this is "a very convenient faith, to those, who are to *gulp* down the bitter potion of thirty-nine articles, *before they can lay hold of the golden prize which glitters before them*." These are the words of the[b] *Calm Inquirer. Address*, &c., p. 11.

[a] This *candour* must also carry the writer so far as to induce him, even though it were acknowledged that *Athanasius* had mutilated any writing, to admit the testimony of that Father to its completeness. If it does not carry him so far, it will answer no purpose on the present occasion. This however is a degree of candour, in which, although it cannot be supposed that *I* have any indisposition towards Athanasius, I certainly should not be able to imitate this Calm Inquirer.

[b] This really sounds so very like the language which we are accustomed to hear from *another* Calm Inquirer, in his *habitual revilings* of the Clergy of the Established Church, that one might be almost tempted, notwithstanding the miserable stupidity of this anonymous writer, to imagine both Calm Inquirers to be the same. However, be it known to *this* Calm Inquirer, whoever he may be, that even the one or two articles, which comprise the *Hackney* or *Essex Street* faith, would be found by any honest, pious, and intelligent *Christian*, a more difficult swallow, than, not merely the *thirty-nine*, but five hundred articles, conceived in the same spirit with them, and governed by the same adherence to Scripture: and for this plain reason; that whatever might tempt him to such a swallow, it *could not be* the love of truth combined with knowledge.—Be it known also to this Calm Inquirer, that with respect to "the glittering prize," which, *in the honesty of his conscience, he believes* to be the inducement with the Clergy of the Establishment to subscribe the Articles of their creed,—the disinterested ministers of the classes with which he associates obtain, individually, much more of this by their *dissent* from those Articles,

Thus we see how victoriously this Unitarian champion winds up his argument. And yet, so great is the force of prejudice, opposed to all this powerful reasoning, sharpened, even as it is, by such keenness of wit, that, unless it can be made to appear a little more clearly, 1. that a witness's own

than nine tenths of the Established Clergy do by their *acquiescence*.—It is well known that, viewing the matter as a mere question of gain,—the light in which this writer's taste disposes him to consider it,—the Non-Conformist teachers drive a more gainful trade than the great majority of our Clergy; and a *much* more gainful one, than the *same* persons, generally, would have any chance of driving, had they abandoned the Conventicle for the Church: and this too, even admitting, that there were room for so many additional candidates for ecclesiastical emoluments.

Those, then, who, with the CALM INQUIRER, would make traffic of their ministry, have no just cause for the jealousy which he expresses. They really have no right to complain. They have not only more of actual gain, but, if the heads of the church be excepted, they have, from the usual operation of party spirit, more of distinction and individual sway, than the members of our Clergy at large. If, then, there be on their side, not only more of positive profit; but, if, in addition to this, there be the indulgence of vanity, and the gratification of spleen, —qualities, which, time out of mind, have belonged to the family of *Dissent*, —why should the CALM INQUIRER be disturbed from his *calmness* by the contemplation of the advantages of the National Clergy?

N.B. I have lately seen, somewhere, a proposal for publishing the *lives* of English Unitarian teachers. And, some time back, we had a splendid account of a PORTRAIT to be taken of the *Rev. Thomas Belsham*, and an ENGRAVING also, by two of the most distinguished artists, in consideration of his exertions in editing the *Improved Version of the New Testament*. (See *Monthly Rep.* vol. iv. p. 119, by which we are informed, by the by, who has been *the Editor*, or at least *the principal Editor*, of this extraordinary production.) Thus *lives, portraits, biographical notices, literary puffings*, and distinctions of all sorts, are heaped upon persons, merely because they rank as the teachers of certain Non-Conformist classes: whilst the parochial clergy of the Established Church are left to their labours and their obscurity.

In a calculation, such as that which the CALM INQUIRER has forced upon us here, it is also fair to advert to the previous institution for the clerical office; both as a matter of qualification, and of expense. I cannot pronounce as to the usage in England; not being acquainted with it; but I can positively assert, that, in this country, no person can be admitted into Holy Orders, without a preparatory occupation of ELEVEN YEARS, at the least, (from the commencement of *classical* learning,) in the School and the University. I speak here of the established rules of Ordination, requiring Collegiate testimonials, from which I do not know of any departure. What then the outfit is, even in point of expenditure, it is not difficult to judge. The Unitarians, and most other classes of Non-Conformists, can say how the matter stands as to their *academies* and *systems of education*. In some cases, it is well known, the individual is his own University; confers his own degrees and orders; and has little more difficulty in the way of his vocation, than to find a new hat, a stout pony, and a pair of saddle bags.—Now, if the CALM INQUIRER will have it to be a mere matter of lucre, where lies the better bargain?

declaration is decisive of his truth; or, 2. that his deliberate mutilation of one part of a written document which he attests renders him more credible as to the remainder; or, 3. that he may be at the same time a credible and not a credible witness to the same point,—I must, after all, and, I apprehend, so will a great majority of my readers, continue under the impression, (for the reasons, already assigned, at pp. 77—81. 87—106 of this volume,) that the first two chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are to be received as genuine Scripture, notwithstanding the alleged want of these chapters in the respective copies of the *Ebionites* and *Marcion*.

But what shall we say if the entire foundation of the argument, with which the *Editors* and their CALM INQUIRER have been amusing us, be itself a *fiction;* and if it shall appear, not only that the *Ebionite Gospel* was not a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, nor the *Marcionite Gospel* a copy of that of St. Luke, but that neither of them *professed* to be such? What, in this case, becomes of the *fact*, of the want of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, or of any parts of these Gospels, in the books of these ancient heretics? Now, upon a full investigation of the testimonies of the Fathers, from whom alone we can derive information as to what the books of these heretics actually contained, this case seems to be satisfactorily established. To enter into the proof, here, would occupy too much room. It is, fortunately, however, altogether unnecessary; as the subject has been already fully discussed, and the results of the above testimonies carefully ascertained, by the most competent judges, to whom reference can easily be had. To bring the matter within the smallest compass, I am satisfied to appeal to those very judges whom the Unitarians pronounce to be the most to be relied upon on subjects such as this. To assist in determining on all points relating to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, the *Editors* inform us, in their *Introduction*, (p. vii,) that "the learned *Jeremiah Jones* on the Canon, and *Dr. Lardner's* laborious work upon the credibility

of the Gospel History, contain the *most accurate and copious information*." They might have referred to other distinguished authorities on the same subject, who would have thrown much light on the present question. But I am willing to abide by the decision of those arbiters whom the Unitarians have themselves selected, and who, undoubtedly, are well entitled to the praise bestowed on them, for the industry and learning which they have displayed in their inquiries into the authenticity of the writings of the New Testament.—Now what is the report of these writers?

And, first, as to the *Ebionites*, what says "the learned *Jeremiah Jones?*" He tells us, that these *Ebionites* (whom he pronounces to be "a most ridiculous set of heretics, who scarcely deserved the name of Christians," vol. ii. p. 270) possessed a Hebrew Gospel, which he proves at length to have been "a spurious and apocryphal piece;" "not mentioned in any of the ancient catalogues;" "not cited by any of the ancient writers;" "not read in any of the assemblies of the primitive Christians;" "containing several things[a] contrary to certainly known and undoubted truths;" also "things trifling and silly[b];" "things later than the time in which it pretends to have been written;" and that, so far from professing to be a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, it, though principally compiled from that Gospel, "pretended to be

[a] Among the instances of this nature, which have been adduced, it may be sufficient to mention one, as illustrative of the degree of corruption to which this Ebionite Gospel had been carried. —"The mother and brethren of Christ spake to him and said; John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him: He said to them, In what have I sinned, that I have need to go to be baptized by him, unless my saying this proceeds from ignorance?" And, after thus describing our Lord's *unwillingness* to submit to John's Baptism, this Gospel goes on to put into our Lord's mouth reasons for *denying baptism to John, who had fallen down before our Lord to entreat it of him.* Other instances of such strange fabrication will be found in *Jones*, vol. i. pp. 376–379. 541. See also *Lardner's Works*, vol. ii. pp. 127, 128. *Mill. Proleg.* pp. 6. 31, 32. *Grot.* (Crit. Sac. vol. vi. pp. 40. 572.)—*Voss. Dissert. de Gen. Jes. Chr.* pp. 16, 17. *Ittig. de Hæresiarch.* pp. 76—82. *Mich. Introd.* vol. iii. pp. 176—180. *Dr. Laurence's Crit. Refl.* pp. 34—37. 44, 45.

[b] Such as our Lord's saying, that "his mother, the Holy Ghost, laid hold of him by one of his hairs, and carried him into the great mountain Tabor," &c., &c. For similar instances, see *Jones*, vol. i. p. 379; also the Authors referred to in the preceding note.

made by the Twelve Apostles." (*New and Full Method*, &c., vol. i. pp. 219—223. 272. 330—387.

Again, what says *Dr. Lardner?* Substantially the same things that *Jeremiah Jones* has said: admitting both the fact of the compilation, and the introduction of foreign and spurious matter. "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," by which he understands the Gospel used by the Ebionites, this writer pronounces to have been a compilation later in time than "our genuine Gospels;" having, indeed, as its *groundwork*, "St. Matthew's Gospel," but with "*additions* of things taken out of St. Luke's (and perhaps other gospels) and *other matters that had been delivered by oral tradition*." (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 84.) He has gone very fully into this subject of the Gospel used by the *Ebionites*, as well as their opinions, and their fabrication of Apocryphal writings, in various other parts of his works.—See vol. ii. pp. 127. 143. 358; vii. pp. 19—24; ix. pp. 255. 322. 329.

Thus, then, after the most ample and accurate examination of the various accounts of the Ebionites and their Gospel, transmitted to us by the ancient Fathers, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, *Jerome*, &c., the result which we arrive at, through the laborious researches of *Jones* and *Lardner*, is, that the Gospel in question was no more than a compilation from the genuine Gospels, founded upon Matthew as its principal groundwork, and including matter not contained in any part of canonical Scripture: in other words, a garbled selection from the Gospels, with spurious additions: so that it neither was nor pretended to be a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, however it might have been framed upon that Gospel as its foundation. The same result has been abundantly established by numerous[a] other writers of

[a] *Grotius*, whose authority Unitarians so much affect to value, concurs in the general charges of corruption against the *Ebionite Gospel*, (*Crit. Sacr.* vol. vi. pp. 40, 41. 572,) but conceives the groundwork to be the Gospel of St. Matthew, *mutilated* by the *Ebionites* to accommodate it to their peculiar opinions.—*Casaubon* (*adv. Baron. Annal. exerc.* xvi. pp. 279. 485.) pronounces this Gospel, so far from being an authentic copy of St. Matthew, to have been a *Work full of fables and corruptions of every sort*.—*Dr. Grabe* (*Spicil. Patr.* vol. i. p. 15, &c.) goes so far as to affirm, that it was not even formed

distinguished note; but I have been desirous to present here, unmixed with any other, the decisions of *Jones* and

on the groundwork of Matthew's Gospel, but a distinct work altogether, composed by the Jewish converts, and afterwards spoken of erroneously under the title of Matthew's Gospel. *Mill* (in his *Proleg.* pp. 31, 32) contends for the idea of a *mutilated* copy of St. Matthew having formed the groundwork: and that upon this was superinduced matter from the other gospels, so as to compose a διατέσσαρον, but a corrupted one.—*Vossius* (*Diss. de Gen. Jes. Chr.* pp. 15—18) describes this Gospel as a *mutilated* and *interpolated* copy of a Gospel, formed on the groundwork of St. Matthew by the *Nazarenes.* — *Dr. Mangey*, in his *Remarks upon the Nazarenus* of *Toland*, [who preceded the Unitarians, in the use attempted to be made of this fictitious *Ebionite* copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, but whose inconsistencies upon the subject, great as they were, *Mr. Wilson* has shown in his *Illustrations*, pp. 274—305, to be much less extravagant than those of *Dr. Priestley* and his followers,] contends, that this Gospel, so far from being a copy of St. Matthew's, was altogether a *chimerical* and *forged* production, (chap. vi. p. 35; chap. viii. pp. 58, 59.)—*Dr. Whitby's* conclusion concerning this Gospel is, that "it was not a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, free from additions and interpolations," but a translation of the Greek Gospel of Matthew into Hebrew, "with the same liberty of making *additions* to it from *tradition*, which we find in the *Chaldee* paraphrast: which Version the primitive Christians among the Gentiles, who were ignorant of that language, finding in their hands,—might think an original written for their use." (*Pref. Disc. to the Gospels*, pp. xlvi, xlvii.) —*Michaelis*, (*Introd.* vol. iii. pp. 174—180,) having adduced numerous instances of gross fabrication, ascribed to the Gospel of the *Ebionites*, concludes with saying, that it appears from those instances, that this "was not the original Gospel of St. Matthew; but, on the contrary, that it was a composition put together, partly from St. Matthew's, and partly from the other Gospels:" at pp. 179, 180, particularly, he adduces examples of selections from other Gospels besides that of Matthew; and, at p. 176, he observes, that there is reason to "doubt, whether the *Ebionites* themselves ascribed to it the name of St. Matthew's Gospel." He might indeed have gone farther, and pronounced positively, that they did *not* ascribe to it that name; when, in the preceding page, he has noticed the declaration of *Epiphanius*, that the *Ebionites* "*themselves* called it the *Hebrew Gospel;*" and when he has shown, also, from *Epiphanius's* declaration, that, from the great *corruptions* and *mutilations* of this Gospel, it could not with any colour of probability be considered as the Gospel of St. Matthew. But, still further, it appears from another part of *Epiphanius*, that this Gospel actually claimed to be the production of the *twelve Apostles*. See *Jer. Jones*, vol. i. pp. 380, 381. And that the names which were attributed to this Gospel by those to whom it belonged were, the *Gospel according to the Apostles*, and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, is manifest from the writings of the Fathers, although they themselves occasionally allude to it, as if it were supposed to be a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel. Why they have done so, may be easily explained, from their having generally conceived it to have been founded upon that Gospel, and for a reason which shall be adverted to hereafter.

Were I now, after the judgments of so many learned critics, to hazard an opinion of my own upon this subject, I would say, that I conceive the Ebionite Gospel to have been a mutilated and corrupted copy of that of the Nazarenes; which was itself formed by *ad-*

Lardner, as being the favourite authorities chosen by the Unitarians themselves.—Having seen the true nature of "*this purest copy of the Gospel of Matthew;* which was possessed by the *Ebionites;*" "this Gospel which they would *on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail;*" we may, now, proceed to the *equally* immaculate copy of Luke's Gospel by *Marcion*.

As before, we shall here appeal to the two selected judges, *Jones* and *Lardner*. And, first, *Jones* tells us, that "the Gospel of *Marcion* was really no other than one of our present Gospels, *wretchedly corrupted and altered by that silly heretic*." He quotes *Tertullian*, also, as saying, that "*Marcion* has *prefixed no Author's name* to his Gospel, as if he might not as justly have forged a title as have corrupted the whole book." The Gospel, which *Marcion* thus "changed and corrupted, was" (he adds) "the Gospel of St. Luke: the nature of these corruptions he collects from *Irenæus*, *Tertul-*

ditions to the Gospel of St. Matthew from the other Gospels as well as from tradition: this Gospel being, of course, later than our canonical Gospels; and the *Ebionite* much later still than this; for, it is to be observed, we find no mention of an *Ebionite Gospel* until near the close of the second century. This, as it appears to me, goes a great way to reconcile the apparent differences in the testimony of the Fathers. The *Ebionite* Gospel might thus be generally spoken of as the *Nazarene* Gospel, being but a modification of it, at a later period; and the *Nazarene* Gospel might, in like manner, (and, through it, the *Ebionite*,) be described, in loose phrase, as the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew: the difference between the *Ebionite* and the *Nazarene* copies might then justly be pointed out; and, whilst the former was described as a mutilated representation of St. Matthew's Gospel, (*ἀπὸ μέρους, καὶ οὐχὶ ὅλῳ*,) the latter might be spoken of as *πληρέστατον*; that is, as *Michaelis* explains this word, as a *lectio plenior*, which might contain *more* than the original text. See *Michaelis*, especially, at vol. iii. pp. 175, 176. *Τριπλῆς Le Clerc* calls it.—Besides, *Jerome's* report of the *two* descriptions of *Ebionites* (one being probably the *Nazarene*) would be thus sufficiently accounted for. In this view of the subject, I feel myself nearer to *Vossius*, *Grotius*, and *Mill*, (particularly the first,) than to any other of the writers whom I have here quoted. But whether this solution prove satisfactory or not, has nothing to do with the question now before us. That the *Ebionite* Gospel cannot be considered as a *true copy of St. Matthew's Gospel;* and that it was not pretended to be such; and did not even assume the name;—is all that it is requisite at present to establish: and whether this *be* established, it is for the reader to judge.—On the *Ebionites*, their opinions, and the Gospel used by them, *Ittigius de Hæresiarchis* deserves particularly to be referred to, in addition to the writers already named. See pp. 59—83.

lian, and *Epiphanius;* and he charges *Marcion* not only with "*taking away* entirely the two first chapters of Luke and many other parts," but also with "*inserting* a great many things of his own; all designed for the propagating his silly principles." (Vol. i. pp. 326, 327.)—What, again, is the report of *Lardner?*—That the *Evangelium of Marcion* "contained only one of the four Gospels, viz. that of St. Luke; and this *mutilated and altered*, and even *interpolated* in a great variety of places:" that "he *would not allow it to be called the Gospel of St. Luke:*" that "some of his followers considered it as written partly by Christ himself, and partly by the Apostle Paul:" that "*Marcion* retrenched the first and second chapters entirely, and began his Gospel at the first verse of the third chapter, and even read this different from our copies, viz.[a] *that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, God descended into Capernaum, a city of Galilee.*" (See *Lardner's Works*, vol. ix. p. 394.) This writer then proceeds (through pp. 394—402) to exhibit numerous instances of the *mutilations*[b] and *corruptions*

[a] This sentence, if indeed it can be supposed to have been derived from St. Luke at all, may be considered as a corrupted combination of part of the *first verse* of the *third chapter* with part of the *thirty-first verse* of the *fourth chapter* of that Gospel: at which latter verse this copy of *Marcion* may, of course, be considered to begin. See *Mill. Proleg.* pp. 34, 35.

[b] Of these *mutilations* noticed by *Lardner*, as in reference to the contents of St. Luke's Gospel, I here subjoin a list; that the reader may the better judge of the *consistency* of the respect which the *Editors* show for the authority of *Marcion*, as to his omissions of matter contained in that Gospel.

Chap. i. ii. iii. 2; iv. 31; part of viii. 19; part of x. 21; xi. part of 29, and all of 30, 31, 32. 49, 50, 51; xii. 6. 28; part of 30 and 32; xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, part of 28, and all of 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35; xv. 10—32; xvii. part of 10 and 12, 13, and part of 14; xviii. 31, 32, 33; xix. 27—47; xx. 8—18. 37, 38; xxi. 18. 21, 22; xxii. 16. 35, 36, 37. 51; xxiii. 43; xxiv. 26, 27.—These it must be remembered, also, are only such omissions as can be, at this day, verified from the writings of the Fathers, especially *Epiphanius*. How much more of what is contained in St. Luke was not in this *Evangelium* of *Marcion*, it is impossible to pronounce; none of the Fathers having proposed to enumerate the differences; as *Læffler* has properly remarked, with respect to *Epiphanius* especially, who might, above all, be conceived to have had this object in view. (See *Comm. Theol.* vol. i. p. 214.) But, besides these instances of matter *omitted*, we have many supplied to us by *Lardner*, of passages different from the corresponding ones in Luke's Gospel; of matter also not contained in Luke; and of subjects placed in a different order.

charged against the *Evangelium* of *Marcion;* and concludes with saying, that "on an impartial review of the alterations" made by him, although some are trifling, yet, "*many* of them are *undoubtedly designed perversions*, intended to countenance, or, at least, not directly contradict, those absurd principles, which he and his followers espoused." —He, next, brings under review the gross corruptions of *Marcion's Apostolicon*, with which we have no immediate concern; and at page 448, pronounces, as a general result, of this heretic, that, of the Scriptures at large, he *rejected whatever did not suit his purpose.* In another part of his works, this writer declares his opinion to be, that *Marcion* had made Luke's Gospel the groundwork of a compilation, omitting what he pleased of this Gospel, and taking from the others such things as suited his purpose; and that this was probably the reason, why his Gospel bore the title of no author whatever. As for *Marcion* himself, he pronounces him to have been "the *most arbitrary*, and *most licentious* of all the ancient heretics, in his judgment concerning the Scripture that should be received, and in his manner of treating such as were received by him: so that *his opinion can be no prejudice to the genuineness, or the notoriety of any of those books of the New Testament, which were received by the Catholics, and indeed by most heretics like-*

(Vol. ix. pp. 394—402.) The general account of this Gospel in relation to St. Luke's, as it has been given by an ancient Father, may satisfy us, (if any thing more can be wanted,) how slight the resemblance was altogether between the two. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ χαρακτὴρ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν σημαίνει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς δὲ ἠκριτηρίασται, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἔχων, μήτε μέσα, μήτε τέλος, &c., καὶ οὐ καθ' ἑρμὸν πάλιν ἐτιμένει ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν, ὡς προεῖπον, παρακόπτει, τὰ δὲ προστίθησιν ἄνω κάτω, οὐκ ὀρθῶς βαδίζων, ἀλλ' ἐβραδιουργημένως πάντα περινοστιών. *Epiph. Hæres.* 42, page 311.

This is that *pure copy* of the Gospel of Luke, which, being "the only Gospel which *Marcion* believed to be authentic," he would, of course (like the *Ebionites* with regard to Matthew's Gospel) "on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail." Yet the *Editors* of the *I. V.* have, it is to be observed, not followed this *purest copy of Luke*, either in its omissions or alterations; save, only, in leaving out the first two chapters, and, even of these, they have retained the first four verses; thus every way discrediting their own unblemished model. There seems a treachery in their praise. They commend, but to desert. Witness *Newcome, Griesbach*, and, now, even *Marcion* and the *Ebionites*.

wise:" and, having established this by abundant authority, he closes with the expression of *Tertullian* concerning this heretic, that he *used a knife, and not a style.* (*Works,* vol. vi. pp. 657—660.)

Such are the sentiments of *Jones* and *Lardner* respecting *Marcion* and his *Gospel: that very Marcion,* upon whose "LEARNING AND INTEGRITY" the *Unitarian Editors* rely in their adjustment of an important part of the canon of the N. T.: and *that very Gospel,* upon the authority of which they pronounce the first two chapters of St. Luke to be spurious, in opposition to every Manuscript, every Version, and every ancient document, relating to the subject, which is known to be in existence throughout the world!

Having now followed the *Editors* to that tribunal, to which they are most willing to appeal, it is unnecessary for me to refer them to the numerous other distinguished critics, who [a]

[a] On the subject of *Marcion* and his Gospel, there seems, now, indeed, to be scarcely more than one opinion amongst all well-informed writers, who have lately treated of it. From a more accurate examination of the ancient authorities relating to this Gospel, (*Irenæus, Tertullian,* and *Epiphanius,*) it has become the general opinion, that it was not intended as a copy of St. Luke's Gospel, but as an Evangelium compiled by *Marcion* for his own purposes, from various sources, (the Gospel of Luke among others,) and opposed by him and his followers, to *all the four* Gospels, which the Catholics held to be *canonical.* This is the decided opinion of *Semler* (*Proleg. in Ep. ad Gal.* § 2, 3) and of *Griesbach.* (*Hist. Text. Græc. Epist. Paul.* Spec. I. Sect. iii. § 8.) We have an essay also in *Velth. Comm. Theol.,* (vol. i. pp. 180—218,) in which this point is established at length, by a full display of the *great dissimilitude* between the two Gospels, and of the other circumstances which evince this Evangelium to have been but a *compilation,* without the slightest pretence to be a copy of St. Luke's Gospel. Why it came, under these circumstances, to have been spoken of *as* such, the learned writer also explains, from a principle held particularly by *Irenæus,* that, from some of the FOUR GOSPELS, all others, that claimed the name, *must necessarily,* have been derived: from which principle, he observes, it followed, that instead of being described as separate Gospels, they were considered as corruptions of that canonical Gospel, to which they seemed most nearly to approach: and, that hence, as the *Ebionites* were charged with having used a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, but greatly adulterated, the same thing was urged against the *Marcionites,* with respect to the Gospel of St. Luke; whereas, neither the one class of heretics, nor the other, pretended to exhibit the Gospels of these Evangelists. (Ibid. p. 215.) *Dr. Marsh,* also, concurs with the writers already named, conceiving it probable that *Marcion* used some *apocryphal* Gospel, which had much in common with St. Luke. (*Marsh's Mich.* vol. iii. part 2, pp. 159, 160.) And *Dr. Laurence,* in the third chapter of his

concur with the learned writers just named, in pronouncing that the Gospel of *Marcion* cannot be considered as a copy of St. Luke's Gospel, nor as intended to be proposed as such. Yet there is, after all, *one* authority, which the *Editors* (or *one Editor*, at least, surely) must deem of such paramount importance, that I cannot avoid calling it to my aid (even though it be *ex abundanti*) upon the present subject. This authority is no other than that of *Mr. Thomas Belsham*, who, in his *Answer* to *Bishop Burgess's Brief Memorial*, has favoured the public with a lengthened view of the true state of the case respecting *Marcion;* informing us of that, with which all persons conversant with ecclesiastical history were already familiar; but which, being a recent discovery with *Mr. Belsham*, is naturally dwelt upon with all the interest which novelty excites. This writer informs us, (I give the substance for the sake of brevity,) that one of the apocryphal narratives which were in circulation before the Canon was formed, was selected by *Marcion*, under the bias, no doubt, of a prejudice in favour of his own system: and that, in this, he probably added or omitted upon the authority of other copies, what he thought would render it more perfect; and "thus formed what he called an *Evangelium*, or an epitome of the Evangelical history." This, *Mr. Belsham* thinks the more probable, because "MARCION DOES NOT ATTRIBUTE HIS COPY TO ANY PARTICULAR AUTHOR." The history, of which *Marcion* made the principal use, our critic collects to be that of Luke; in which he made such additions and alterations as he deemed expedient; but "HE DID NOT[a] PRETEND TO PASS OFF HIS EVANGELIUM AS THE GOSPEL

Critical Reflections, &c., has clearly and fully summed up the strong points of the case, coinciding in the same conclusion. [Indeed both the 2d and 3d chapters of this work of *Dr. Laurence*, deserve to be *particularly* attended to by all who would wish to see a full exposure of the absurd attempts of the *Unitarian Editors* to set up the idle story of *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* COPIES of *Matthew* and *Luke* against the genuine Gospels of these Evangelists.]

[a] On this point *Mr. Belsham* expresses himself with indignant warmth at the unfair treatment which the worthy and learned *Marcion* has met with at the hands of the *Orthodox*. Whilst this honest heretic, "did not pretend to pass off *his Evangelium* as the *Gospel of Luke*, yet his *Orthodox* review-

OF LUKE." "*The liberties which Marcion exercised in forming this* ECLECTIC GOSPEL," Mr. B. admits, "*would not in-*

ers, finding that Luke was his principal authority, rate him most unmercifully for every passage in which he deviates from *what they choose to represent as his original;* as if he was a voluntary falsifier and corrupter of Luke's text." (*Append. to Disc.* p. 123.) What makes this conduct of the *Orthodox* the more unjustifiable is, that, as *Mr. Belsham* assures us in the same page, "*Marcion* maintains, *not* that his was a *genuine copy of Luke,* but *a genuine Evangelium.*" Now, undoubtedly, if *Marcion's* Gospel was not pretended, by him or his followers, to be a copy of St. Luke's Gospel, nothing could be more unfair, than to allege its deviations from that Gospel, as proofs of its falsification of St. Luke. But, then, the whole of this hard treatment of *Marcion* turns upon the assertion, that his Gospel was meant to be received as a copy of St. Luke's: for, this being once admitted, no language of accusation, on the ground of corruption, could be too strong. Now, by whom has this assertion been made?—I have often, in the course of these sheets, been compelled to make my reader stare, by stating plain facts; and I have no doubt I shall do so now. The persons by whom this assertion has been made, and repeated again and again, and dwelt upon as the great foundation of their arguments against the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel, are,—MR. BELSHAM, THE EDITORS OF THE I. V., and their associates. That the *Orthodox,* indeed, have, upon the position, that *Marcion's* Gospel was a copy of St. Luke's, been *so* unreasonable as to found the assertion that it must *in that case* be condemned as a false and corrupt copy, cannot be denied. But that the *position* itself is a fundamental one with the Unitarian critics, the reader shall have the means of satisfying himself.

First, we shall see what *Mr. Belsham* says. In describing the degree of weight which *Marcion's* testimony had in determining his judgment in the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Luke, he says,—"He" (*Marcion*) "like some *learned Christians* of modern times, rejected, but, *as I think,* without sufficient reason, all the evangelical histories excepting that of Luke." [It must be a great satisfaction to the *Orthodox* to find that MR. BELSHAM *really thinks* there is not quite *sufficient* reason for rejecting the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, *although* some LEARNED *Christians,* meaning MR. EVANSON of course, are of a different opinion. But to return to St. Luke.] "Of THIS Gospel," (St. Luke's) "WE KNOW, that he" (*Marcion*) "*professed to believe, that* THE COPY WHICH HE USED *was genuine and authentic,* and that other copies had been interpolated and corrupted."—"HIS COPY *did not contain the history of the miraculous conception,* this narrative he *therefore* rejected," &c. (*Letters on Arianism,* p. 71.) [We may note here, as we pass, how exactly *Mr. Belsham* and his brother Editors have followed the example of Marcion. "THEIR COPY" (which they have made for themselves) "*does not contain the history of the miraculous conception:* this narrative they THEREFORE (!) reject." &c.] Again, as an argument against the narrative of the miraculous conception both in St. Matthew and St. Luke, this Writer thus expresses himself in the very beginning of his *Calm Inquiry.* (p. 12.) "The *Ebionite Gospel of Matthew,* and the *Marcionite Gospel of Luke,* did not contain these accounts: and *both* those sects *maintained* their own to be the UNCORRUPTED, UNMUTILATED COPIES OF THESE EVANGELICAL HISTORIES." —Again, what say the *Editors;* that is, what says *Mr. Belsham* in another form? Just the same that he has said before. "The two first chapters of this

deed be tolerated in modern times." He allows, also, the errors of this heretic to have been extremely gross; and that "he

Gospel were wanting in the copies used by *Marcion.*"—"He, like some moderns, rejected all the evangelical histories excepting Luke, of which he contended that his own was a correct and authentic copy." (*Imp. Vers.* p. 120.) The very same language used here by *Mr. Belsham,* both in his *individual* and in his *aggregate* capacity, is echoed by *Mr. B.* in his attack upon the *Quarterly Reviewers,* (*Month. Repos.* vol. iv.,) and by the CALM INQUIRER, in his *Address,* &c. So that, in every shape in which *Mr. Belsham* had, or can be suspected to have appeared before the date of his answer to Bishop Burgess, whether open or covert, whether by himself or through his *vicarius,* his note is found to be uniformly the same, that *Marcion* MAINTAINED HIS GOSPEL TO BE A COPY OF ST. LUKE'S; and also MAINTAINED IT TO BE A CORRECT AND AUTHENTIC COPY. *Now,* he tells us, as we have seen above in his answer to Bishop Burgess, that the assertion, that *Marcion's* Gospel was a copy of St. Luke's, was merely an invention of the wicked *Orthodox,* for the purpose of fastening upon the unoffending *Marcion* the charge of falsifying Scripture, on the ground of the great dissimilarity between his copy and St. Luke's Gospel; whereas *Mr. Belsham* assures us, that *Marcion's* Evangelium was a Gospel of his own composition, never intended to pass for a copy of St Luke's, nor even asserted by him to be a copy of that Gospel.—Thus we see it is never too late to learn. And that, which had been repeatedly pressed upon *Mr. Belsham,* and the Unitarians, (but in vain,) as a reason, why nothing *could* be inferred, as to the genuineness of any part of the Gospel of St. Luke, from what was or was not in the Gospel of *Marcion,* is now brought forward by *Mr. Belsham,* as an important discovery, to the irreparable disgrace of the *Orthodox;* who, it seems, have hitherto been contending that *Marcion's* was designed to be a copy of St. Luke's Gospel! I sincerely wish *Mr. Belsham* joy of this DISCOVERY: and, at the same time, of its unavoidable result; namely, that we can draw no conclusion affecting the genuineness of the narrative of the miraculous conception in St. Luke's Gospel, from the non-existence of this narrative in a Gospel, which did not affect to be a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke.

However, on looking again into *Mr. Belsham,* I find we orthodox are not to have the pleasure of his company throughout the entire of the argument. He has travelled with us through the premisses, but he stops short, and is absolutely *restive,* at the conclusion. Indeed, he seems to think, that the conclusion *against* the genuineness of the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel is as fairly to be derived from the supposition that *Marcion's* Evangelium was *not* a copy of that Gospel, as from the supposition that it *was.* Perhaps he may be right upon this head. But we must let his reasons speak for themselves. Here, I apprehend, I shall again surprise my readers not less than before. After having made the various concessions, quoted in this note, and in the text above, together with many others, as to the arbitrary nature of the formation of *Marcion's* Gospel, especially as to his expunging whatever did not correspond with his theories, which are admitted to have been extravagant and absurd, and with which, by the by, the human birth of Christ under any circumstances was totally incompatible, —our author proceeds to say,—"And, *though it is reasonable to admit, that Marcion* LEFT OUT *of his Evangelium some passages,* WHICH WERE UNFAVOURABLE TO HIS SYSTEM, there is *no proof* that he INSERTED any thing, which he did not believe to be au-

took the liberty of LEAVING OUT, from his copy of the Gospel," (as well as from his Apostolicon,) "*those passages from which*

thentic." And thus, having endeavoured to clear this Gospel of the charge of the INTERPOLATION *of false matter*, he concludes that, "*upon the whole, there is no reason to believe, that the account of the miraculous conception was found in that copy of Luke's Gospel which Marcion used*"! Here now is the consummation of this most wonderful of all the arguments, that either the author of the *Elements*, or even his critical and logical compeer MR. GILCHRIST, has accomplished. *Marcion*, who was in the habit of "LEAVING OUT" what he did not approve in the Gospels from which he selected, *could not* have *left out* the account of the miraculous conception, if it was in that copy of St. Luke's Gospel which he used. Very well: why not? He could not have left this out,—BECAUSE, "*there is no proof, that he* INSERTED *any thing which he did not believe to be authentic*"!—He TOOK AWAY many things it is true; but he did NOT TAKE AWAY *this:* BECAUSE, HE MADE NO UNAUTHORIZED *additions*. Or, to put it in a still shorter way: *He did not take away* THIS; BECAUSE, *although he took away whatever he chose, he* ADDED *nothing!* Learners, undoubtedly, in the elements of numbering, are in the habit of looking to *addition* as the PROOF of *subtraction*. — Really these things can only be laughed at. And, yet, such are the arguments which, in the nineteenth century, the advocate of Revelation is doomed to combat in defence of the *integrity of the sacred text!*

I did think, that I had done with *Mr. Belsham*, on the subject of this note. But he furnishes matter almost inexhaustible. There is a *variety* in his views of any one subject, that renders it impossible to do him justice, by any thing short of the actual perusal of his productions. And, in truth, unless from direct inspection, the reader cannot easily be brought to *credit* the perpetual self-contradiction, and direct violations of *known truth*, which openly and glaringly accompany the movements of his pen, on all subjects connected with the Unitarian question. We have seen him, both in the course of this note, and in the quotations from him in the text, earnest to vindicate *Marcion* from the charge of corrupting St. Luke's Gospel, on the ground of his not having designed or pretended his Gospel to be a copy of St. Luke's: and we have seen him ascribe to the invention of the *malevolent Orthodox* this unfounded imputation of *Marcion's* having professed to copy Luke's Gospel; whilst, as he is eager to prove, *Marcion* had really compiled a Gospel of his own, which had not Luke's for its model. We have, undoubtedly, at the same time, seen that *Mr. Belsham* himself and his associates have been the persons, in modern times, the most anxious, and the most interested, to support the opinion that *Marcion's* Gospel was a copy of St. Luke's. This, however, was maintained by *Mr. Belsham*, on other occasions, at a distance of time which might permit him to forget what, as it had not truth or knowledge for its foundation, might easily be forgotten. But, will it be credited, that, in this very publication, in which he maintains *Marcion's* Gospel *not* to have been a copy of St. Luke's *nor pretended* to be such, and charges the contrary supposition against the Orthodox as a gross calumny, he himself supports this very supposition with all his might? I must quote him, for I cannot expect otherwise to be believed. "Since *Dr. Priestley*, and others after him, have appealed to MARCION'S COPY OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE," (we see who the ill-minded *orthodox* are, that have viewed *Marcion's* Gospel as a supposed copy of St. Luke's,) "as *an authority for the omission of the account of the miraculous*

it might be inferred, that Jesus was a missionary from the Creator of the world and the God of the Jews," &c.—"pas-

conception of Jesus Christ, it is astonishing to observe," (a very astonishing thing, indeed,) "with what incredible pains learned men have collected together the virulent abuse which the *ancient* orthodox writers have heaped upon that famous heretic," (*all* heretics are *famous*,) "for corrupting, as they call it," (certainly a very uncivil name to give it,) "the *genuine Scriptures*; that is, in other words, for using a different, and, *in some respects, as impartial and well-informed critics acknowledge, a more correct copy than themselves.*" (*Discourse*, &c., p. 117.) Here, then, we find ourselves back again on the old ground. *Marcion's* WAS a copy of St. Luke's Gospel. *Dr. Priestley* said so, and has turned this to account against St. Luke's canonical Gospel. His followers said the same. *Mr. Belsham* said, and now re-says the same. The *Orthodox*, so far from affirming this, say that it differs so widely from St. Luke's Gospel, that it cannot reasonably be believed to be a copy; and have actually had the baseness to proceed upon the ground of ecclesiastical history, and have quoted the reports of the ancient historians, who alone report any thing upon the subject. *Mr. Belsham* also concurs; he says that *Marcion* and St. Luke are *so unlike*, that nothing but the *calumnies* of the Orthodox could ever have given rise to the notion that the Gospel of the one was meant to be given *as a copy* of the other: for that it was quite a distinct Gospel. Yet, at the same time, (with a rapidity of counter movement, that leaves BRESLAW or the *Indian jugglers* at immeasurable distance,) this Gospel of *Marcion's* was not only, as *Dr. Priestley* says, "*a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke*," but, *Mr. Belsham* assures us, "as impartial and well-informed critics acknowledge, a more correct copy," than any of those early Fathers, who have given us an account of *Marcion*, possessed themselves. [Indeed, if I mistake not, *Mr. Belsham* has somewhere gone nearly the length of saying, that it was a more correct copy of Luke than Luke himself ever wrote. His habits of controversy with *Irish* professors possibly led him to this view of the subject.] But, extraordinary as all this is, when taken together, the whole that is extraordinary has not yet appeared. Who are the "impartial and well informed critics," that "acknowledge" the superior correctness of *Marcion's* copy to that which the orthodox Fathers possessed? He tells us, that they are *Michaelis* and his *Annotator:* and refers us, at the foot of the page, to the exact passages, viz. "Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii. part i. p. 271; part ii. p. 159." Now, what do these writers say? Precisely, and unqualifiedly, the *opposite*, word for word, of that, for which *Mr. Belsham* has claimed their support. The words of *Michaelis* are these. "St. Luke's Gospel alone was admitted by *Marcion*, who *made, however, many alterations in it, so as to render it more suitable to his own system.* But *not all* the alterations in *Marcion's* copy are to be considered *as wilful corruptions*, for several of them are nothing more than what modern critics call various readings." *This* is the WHOLE of what *Michaelis* has said upon *Marcion's Gospel*, in the place referred to. The entire of the observations by *Michaelis's Annotator*, is too long to quote. But the reader, on referring to it, will find that *Dr. Marsh*, after speaking of the vast difference between *Marcion's* Gospel and that of St. Luke, proceeds, in refutation of the opinion that the one was a wilfully corrupt copy of the other, to observe;—"That *Marcion* used St. Luke's Gospel at all, is a position which has been taken for granted, without the least proof. *Marcion* himself never pretended, that it was the Gospel of St. Luke, as

sages" (in a word) "which were unfavourable to his system." (Appendix to *Mr. Belsham's Discourse, March* 31, 1814, pp. 121—128.)

Thus, then, we have, from an authority which must be decisive in our argument with the *Editors* of the *I. V.*, being the authority of the *principal Editor* himself, under whose forming hand this Unitarian Version has been fashioned, the full admission of all that can be required upon this subject. It is of little consequence, that what is here admitted, is the most direct possible contradiction to all that this head *Editor* and his subalterns have hitherto maintained; and maintained, as the *essential ground* of their rejection of the first two chapters of Luke: nor is it of the smallest consequence, that, by the application of that miraculous *logic*, by which the author of the *Elements* has already wrought such wonders, he has contrived to arrive at the very conclusion, which his premisses directly overturn. The grand point stands admitted,—that *the Evangelium of Marcion was not a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke, nor intended as such.* We shall, therefore, I trust, now that so much light has broken in upon the *Editors*, and that the facts of Ecclesiastical history are coming by degrees somewhat within their view, hear no more

Tertullian acknowledges," &c. "It is probable, therefore, that he *used some apocryphal Gospel*, which had much matter in common with that of St. Luke, but yet was not the same." In support of this he refers to *Griesbach*, and to *Læffler*, both of whom maintain, that *Marcion's* was not, nor was pretended to be, a copy of St. Luke's Gospel.—Thus, then, to show, that *Michaelis* and *Dr. Marsh affirm, that Marcion* used a more correct copy of St. Luke than the orthodox Fathers, he produces the former, as saying, that *Marcion wilfully* corrupted Luke, although ALL the alterations he made in Luke's Gospel ought not to be pronounced *wilful corruptions:* and the latter as saying, that the difference is so immense, that *Marcion could not* have intended to give a copy of St. Luke, but *must have used some apocryphal Gospel.*

Thus are unlearned Unitarians abused by this writer, whom they refer to as their oracle. And, unfortunately, as Unitarians, in general, read none but the writings of Unitarians, he is enabled to abuse them in this manner, without the danger of detection. The truth is, the more I have been obliged to examine of this writer's productions, the more I am satisfied that he is not to be trusted to in a *single quotation.* I have often been obliged to feel the force of the position, that the *religion of modern Unitarians is not the religion of* TRUTH. No writer impresses this sentiment more strongly upon my mind, than that one who styles himself a *Calm Inquirer.*—The thing is shameful and disgusting.

of the want of the first two chapters in *Marcion's* copy of St. Luke's Gospel, *there having been no such copy.* And, as little, I trust, shall we hear of the want of the first two chapters in the *Ebionite* copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, there being as little reason to pronounce that any such copy of that Gospel ever existed. Those, who may have been weak enough to reject the history of the incarnation of our blessed Lord from the gospels, on the assurances of these critics, may now see what guides they have followed: yet, to such as by false lights have been led to make shipwreck of their faith, it will be but a poor compensation to discover, that it is to the ignorance of those who promised a safe steerage, they owe their misfortune.

To bring this subject to a close, I shall here lay before the reader the one grand sweeping argument of the prime champion and leading *Editor* of the Unitarian Version, whereby the histories of the miraculous conception are at once banished from the genuine gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. It has been already quoted in the last note, (see page 275,) but it deserves to take a station here also. "The *Ebionite* gospel of Matthew and the *Marcionite* gospel of Luke did not contain these accounts: and both those sects maintained their own to be the uncorrupted, unmutilated copies of these evangelical histories." Now, after what has been said, the reader will, I apprehend, be prepared to follow me in saying, that in this whole sentence, whose object is at once to expunge four chapters from the gospels, in the hope of excluding the doctrine of the Incarnation from the New Testament, there is *not a single clause, that has the slightest foundation in fact.* That there was a *Marcionite* Gospel of Luke, and, still more, that the *Marcionites* maintained their gospel to be an uncorrupted unmutilated copy of Luke's history, are statements, now *admitted* by their very propounders to be utterly false. No less false have we shown the corresponding statements[a] respecting the *Ebionite* copies,

[a] We may here defy the *Calm Inquirer*, and his brother *Editors*, together with all the *Unitarian Missionaries*, (north, south, east, and west,) to adduce

whether these gentlemen admit them to be so or not. And, therefore, with these heretics and their absurd admirers of modern times, we need for the present take no further trouble, on the subject of the genuineness of the Evangelical narratives of the miraculous conception: and shall now take our leave of them on this head, simply premising this one observation; that, if all, that this extravagant and unfounded sentence contended for, were true, it would avail nothing for the purpose for which it is designed, so long as it is notorious, that the very earliest proof we have, of the *non-existence* of the narratives of the miraculous conception in the respective gospels of these heretics, is *much later*, in point of time, than the [a] date to which we can carry up, *beyond question*,

a single passage from any ancient writer, in which the truth of *Mr. Belsham's* statement above given, respecting the *Ebionites*, receives support; namely, *that this sect maintained its Gospel to be an uncorrupted and unmutilated copy of St. Matthew*. He has already admitted that he had averred the like *untruly* of the *Marcionites*. He has not dealt *less untruly* by the one than by the other. The fact is, that, of the two, there is even more colour for making the assertion, in the case of the *Marcionites*, than in that of the *Ebionites*. A passage of *Tertullian*, (*Adv. Marcion*, lib. iv. cap. v.,) misunderstood or misrepresented, might be drawn in to furnish some *pretence*, (as indeed it has been so used,) for the position, that the *Marcionites* averred their Gospel to be a copy of St. Luke's. But, they will find it difficult to discover any passage in the writings of the ancients, from which it can fairly be inferred, that the *Ebionites* affirmed their Gospel to be a copy of St. Matthew's. *Epiphanius's* assertion, (*Hæres.* 30, § 13,) that the "*imperfect, spurious,* and *mutilated*" copy of the Gospel, which the *Ebionites* had, was *spoken of* as κατὰ Ματθαῖον, would not of itself prove that the *Ebionites called* their Gospel a copy of St. Matthew's; but when coupled with the words, Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ τούτῳ καλοῦσι, it loses all its force, since the testimony goes to show, that the *Ebionites* themselves called it the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, however it might in common use have received the former appellation. And we have already seen, that the Gospel, from which the *Ebionites* formed theirs, bore, on the face of it, the declaration, that it was composed by the Apostles at large.

[a] *Campbell* has well remarked, (*Four Gospels*, &c., vol. iv. p. 21,) that "the *old Italic* translation and the *Syriac* were probably made before the *name* EBIONITE was known in the church." He might, of course, have made the like assertion of the *name* MARCIONITE also. At all events, it may be made, without much hazard, with respect to those *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* GOSPELS, which are brought forward in opposition to the received Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The great antiquity of those VERSIONS, the *Editors* themselves (as, indeed, there can be but one opinion upon the subject) have freely and fully admitted in their *Introduction*, pp. xv, xvi. And they have truly added, that the value of these very ancient versions is immense, as being made, of course, from manuscripts of the highest antiquity. All this however is forgotten

the existence of the narratives in the genuine gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. So that, in every possible way, in

by the *Editors* and their *Calm Inquirers*, when they come to compare the *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* COPIES (as they call them, *copies of what?*) with the *Manuscripts of the Gospels which now exist*. The *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* copies, "are much older than any of these," they say. Well, but how much older were they than the manuscripts from which the *Syriac* and OLD ITALIC *versions* were made? They do not tell us that. Or how much older were they than the manuscripts from which our present *Alexandrian*, *Vatican*, *Parisian*, and *Cambridge*, or, generally speaking, from which our present oldest manuscripts were made? They do not tell us that neither. But again, HOW old are these *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* COPIES? And WHERE are these copies? The answer is—*They do not exist: and we know nothing either of their existence or their contents, but what we learn from the writings of the Fathers.* Well then, it is plain, we can argue about their existence and their contents, only from what the FATHERS tell us.

Now, as to the *Ebionites*, who is the first that informs us that they had a Gospel, which wanted the history of the miraculous conception? *Epiphanius* is, by the confession of the *Editors*, the earliest writer who has said so, or, rather, he is the only early writer who has said so; as *Dr. Laurence* has proved, in refutation of the *Editors*, who seem resolved to have an Ecclesiastical history of their own, as well as a New Testament, and have in defiance of fact produced *Jerome* as a joint authority with *Epiphanius*. Well, then, about the middle of the *fourth* century, we have an account of the existence, AT THAT TIME, of an *Ebionite* Gospel, called by some the Gospel of Matthew, and in this the first two chapters of Matthew were not found. Is this Gospel, *so wanting these chapters*, traced back by this or any other writer to an earlier period? No. Well, this is to supplant the genuine copies of St. Matthew's Gospel established by decisive proofs for more than two centuries before. (See pp. 87—100, and especially p. 93 of this volume.) It is to supplant the Gospel which *every* existing unmutilated Manuscript, and *every* ancient Version, whatsoever, attests to have been the Gospel received in the Christian church from the beginning, and to which the writings of the Fathers uniformly bear the like attestation.

Again, respecting *Marcion's* Evangelium, or *supposed* copy of St. Luke, from whom have we the earliest account of this Gospel, as being defective in the account of our Lord's nativity? From *Irenæus*, very near the conclusion of the second century, which *Lardner* justly fixes for the time of that Father's writing his *Five Books against Heresies*, in which he notices this fact concerning *Marcion's* Gospel. Here, then, about the conclusion of the second century, and not to any earlier period that we know of, can we fix, as an *ascertained* fact, the existence of a copy of the *Marcionite* Gospel, wanting the account of the Nativity. Indeed, *Marcion* himself, by the best accounts, flourished not until near the middle of this century. So that, even supposing *Marcion's* copy, as described by *Irenæus*, to have remained unaltered from its first composition by that heretic, we see that we cannot in any way presume on the existence of it at a period earlier than about the middle of the second century; and even this, *gratuitous*, as to its being, in the time of *Marcion*, what it was found to be when *Irenæus* wrote against it.

What, then, has become of the *antiquity of Marcion's* COPY OF LUKE, *wanting the first two chapters of that Gospel?* And still more, as we have seen, what has become of the *antiquity* of the *Ebionite* COPIES OF MATTHEW,

which we can view the matter, the proof, which the Unitarians labour to advance against the chapters in question, is simply a proof of their desire to get rid of them, at all hazards, and against all evidence, because they are resolved not to believe the facts which these chapters contain.—Why will not the Unitarian critics learn to distinguish between the *authenticity* and the *credibility* of the writings of the New Testament? Or, rather, I should say of *some* of them[a], why will they *purposely confound* them?

wanting likewise *the first two chapters of this Evangelist?* We cannot, with *certainty*, speak of the one, as earlier than the *latter part of the second century;* nor of the other, as earlier than the *middle of the fourth century.* And is this, after all, the boasted *antiquity* of the DOCUMENTS, before which, even admitting them to be designed as copies of the Gospels whose names have been ascribed to them, all the copies and proofs of the genuine Canonical Gospels which are to be found in the existing *Manuscripts, Versions,* and *Fathers,* and which the *Manuscripts, Versions,* and *Fathers,* UNANIMOUSLY sustain, are at once to vanish! Productions, which are not copies, even if they had antiquity; which have not antiquity, even if they were copies; and which, even if they both were copies and had antiquity, the very persons who produce them discredit, by rejecting in every part but that for which they adduce them; seem not exactly the authorities on which sober and well-intending Christians would rely, in settling the canon of true Scripture; and of course mark, pretty plainly, the character of those persons who would thus employ them.

As to the unquestionable antiquity of the canonical Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, containing as they do at present the chapters relating to the miraculous conception, it must be unnecessary, after the writings of *Lardner, Michaelis,* and *Less,* to make any observations. To this last writer, being now placed within the reach of the English reader by *Mr. Kingdon's* translation, I would refer particularly at page 89, of the *Authenticity, &c., of the New Testament.*—Having mentioned this writer, I cannot, although it is not necessarily connected with the present subject, omit to direct the reader's attention to his able and important observations upon the value of *Irenæus's* testimony to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, to be found at page 115 of the work just cited.—I am the more desirous to do this, because especial pains have been taken (as may be seen at p. 121 of the *Answer to Bishop Burgess,* already noticed) to disparage the authority of this early and venerable Father, on account of the illustration, which he has fancifully applied to the fact of the existence of but four Gospels. The reflections of a serious and impartial inquirer after truth will hereby become contrasted with the light and presumptuous petulance of modern unbelievers, whose great pleasure it is to make a mock of serious things and serious persons; and to whom one of the smallest objects of regard manifestly appears to be, *the truth as it is in Christ.*

[a] The strong language, which, here, and in many other places, I have been forced to employ, in my observations upon Unitarian writers, I wish to be considered as designed to apply only to Unitarians of a certain class: such Unitarians as correspond to the description given of UNITARIANS by *Mr.*

The next point, which I am called upon to defend, in the *Remarks upon the Unitarian Version*, is the observation (to be found at pages 78 and 81 of this volume) on the inconsistency of the *Editors*, in *rejecting the first chapters of St. Matthew as spurious, because they represent Herod as still living, at the time when Christ was born; and at the same time admitting, as unquestionable, the Gospel of the EBIONITES, which pronounces Herod to be living so late as thirty years after our Lord's nativity.* This, the *Editors* pronounce, through their *Calm Inquirer*, to be a mere "cavil unworthy of a man of sense," &c. (*Address*, p. 11.) My observation concerning the Ebionite gospel was grounded upon that, which the *Editors* not only concede, but contend for; viz. that the *Ebionite* gospel began with

Belsham, in his *Review of Mr. Wilberforce*, and in his *Calm Inquiry*; such, in short, as may be considered proper and perfect specimens of what the unqualified culture of Unitarian principles can effect. There are writers bearing the same denomination, who are of a very different order indeed; and who have not so devoted themselves to the objects of a party, as to have turned their backs upon every thing like sober and conscientious investigation, and, indeed, upon all the decencies usually observed in the treatment of serious subjects, but particularly in the discussion of religious truths. Such writers as *Dr. Estlin*, *Mr. Frend*, and *Dr. Carpenter*, staunch as they are in the support of the fundamental Unitarian principle, I should feel concerned, indeed, to be supposed to confound with writers in whom the love of truth seems to have completely yielded to the pride of party. I should be sorry to be supposed to mix such men with *Mr. Gilchrist* or the *Calm Inquirer*. *Dr. Carpenter* (*Unit. the Doct.* &c., pp. 353, 354) has made the distinction in treating of the introductory chapters of St. Luke, which I have pointed to above. And he very fairly observes; "As to the external evidence against the genuineness of the Introduction, it appears to me very slight. We have *only* the judgment of *Marcion*, who lived, however, in the early part of the second century, without knowing the grounds of his judgment, to enable us to ascertain its value." Again, as to the internal difficulties in this part of St. Luke, he admits, that "there is only one of them which can weigh much against *the great body of external evidence*." This difficulty he endeavours to show may be removed by a particular explanation, conformed to his own Unitarian views; but the difficulty itself existed only in reference to the Unitarian hypothesis. Here, however, although he reasons as might be expected from a person holding his opinions concerning the nature of Christ, he does not deny plain facts; he does not scoff at the weight of evidence, in its own nature irresistible to a fair mind; nor does he exalt the heretic *Marcion* upon the ruins of the mass of MSS. Versions and Fathers, that sustain the introductory chapters of Luke, merely because this heretic may be turned (dishonestly) to account in favour of the Unitarian cause.

these [a] words, "In the days of *HEROD KING OF JUDEA*, John came baptizing," &c. But, they say, this is easily explained: for that "some early transcriber had erroneously written *JUDEA*" for *GALILEE*; and so the *cavil* is disposed of.

Now, similar as these two words are, (*so similar*, indeed, that the very persons, who cannot admit that ΘC could have passed into OC by any error of transcribing or otherwise, are quite satisfied, that the similarity of these must have led to the substitution of the one for the other,) yet, one thing has been forgotten, which very much weakens the force of

[a] Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἔχει· ὅτι Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ Ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλιζάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. *Epiphan. Hæres.* 30, § 13. "The beginning of their Gospel was this: '*It came to pass in the days of HEROD THE KING OF JUDEA*, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan; who was said to be of the family of Aaron the High-Priest, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all people went out after him.'"—The learned *Michaelis* says, of "this strange historical blunder, which makes John Baptist preach in the time of *Herod King of Judea*, who had been dead nearly thirty years, when John began to preach;" that the passage appears to have been fabricated, by an absurd composition of two different passages in St. Luke's Gospel, namely, chap. i. 5, and iii. 1, 2, 3."—And, "in like manner," he says, "the words βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, appear to have been put together from Mark i. 4, and Matth. iii. 6." (*Marsh's Michaelis*, vol. iii. part 1, p. 179.) The objections made to these observations of this acute inquirer are destitute of weight. The magnitude of the blunder is a weak ground indeed; it only affords privilege to ignorance. And the selection from various Gospels can create no difficulty, where the document itself is, as we have already seen, (and as is contended for by *Michaelis*,) formed by compilation. Indeed, the very passage before us is, in itself, a decisive proof of this: unless it can be said, that *John's being the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth*, &c., is to be found in St. Matthew's Gospel, and therefore need not be supposed to be derived from that of St. Luke. A favourite hypothesis is a great enemy to impartial investigation. And the theory of a *common Hebrew document* has interfered more than it ought with many important truths affecting the Gospels. On this subject I am unwilling to say more. I could wish not to be compelled to say so much.

The 5th verse of the first chapter of St. Luke begins with the words, Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ βασίλεως τῆς Ἰουδαίας. The reader will judge for himself, whether the framer of the Gospel, described at the beginning of this note, had this passage in view. And he will be the better able to form his judgment, when he finds this very verse proceed to speak of Zacharias and Elizabeth of the family of Aaron, and followed by an account of the birth of John from these parents. St. Luke's is the only Gospel in which the full title, KING OF JUDEA, is given to *Herod*.

this argument from resemblance ; namely, that the word KING, *also*, must have been by the early transcriber erroneously written for TETRARCH. The matter, we see, is accounted for by "a slip of the pen,"—the way in which whatever plain and palpable errors arise (*i. e.* on the side *of Unitarianism*) is properly to be explained. (See *Address*, &c., p. 14.) All this, perhaps, may be very well, so long as we consider the case of a *single* slip. If the transcriber had, by "a slip," EITHER written JUDEA for GALILEE, or KING for TETRARCH, however the *striking similitude* in each couplet may be supposed to have rendered this admissible; yet, it is too much to reckon upon *both slips at once ;* and still more to reckon upon such a *coincidence* of slips, as should bring together *just the two words that consort ;*—since, to have stumbled either upon *Herod* [a] KING OF GALILEE, or upon *Herod* TETRARCH *of* JUDEA, would undoubtedly have appeared somewhat awkward, to those used to the language of Jewish history concerning the kings and governors of those countries. No, no. There is no [b] mistake of transcribers. It is the

[a] That the general denomination of *King*, should be sometimes used for *Herod* who was the *Tetrarch*, where no formal designation was intended, and where no reference was made to the country which constituted his *Tetrarchy*, is a matter which may be conceded: the *Tetrarch* being the ostensible *Sovereign* or *Prince*, to which the term βασιλεὺς, in a loose sense of the word, might not improperly be applied. But, *in connexion with the country over which he presided*, I leave it for the industrious research of the *Editors* and all their *Calm Inquirers* to discover a single instance of the application of the title of KING to any one of the Tetrarchs who succeeded in the government of the divided dominions of *Herod the Great*. They will, if they can, produce an example of *Herod Antipas* being entitled *King of Galilee*, or of *Herod Philip* being entitled *King of Iturea and Trachonitis ;* and it will be still better, if they can produce an example of either of them, entitled KING OF JUDEA.

[b] In addition to the great improbability of the *two chances*, in the errors of transcribing, just *falling together*, so as to make a *concordant whole*, we have, also, to consider the great unlikelihood, of the transcriber having made this double error, or indeed any error, in the *very first sentence* of the document. *In longo sermone*, it is true, the *quandoque bonus dormitat* may be allowed to the transcriber more reasonably even than to the poet. But that he should nod, or rather I should say, dream, in the very first sentence, is not quite so credible. It might as well be said, that the *title* itself was given wrong, by an error of the transcriber; and that by a mere slip of the pen, the words "*Gospel according to St. Matthew*," placed at the head of a document to be transcribed,

plain direct blunder of a garbled document, which was the production of an age far removed from the time of which it treats; and in which we have seen enough of blundering already at pages 267, 268, to reconcile us to any *degree* of it, that might be exhibited in addition.

The *Editors*, indeed, through their *Calm Inquirer*, go on to say, "that no child that was taught to read, ever mistook Herod the king, or tetrarch, of Galilee, who beheaded John, and who was living at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, for that Herod who died in the reign of Augustus, and who was the father of Herod the Tetrarch:" and they conclude with exclaiming against the attempt "to *impose* by such miserable sophistry." The "*sophistry*" consists in simply *stating* the blunder, which, it is confessed, appears on the face of this *Ebionite* document: and the refutation of it lies in asserting the blunder to be[b] *so*

were changed into "*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.*" It will be remembered that the sentence in question is not only the first sentence in this *Ebionite* document, but that it is designed to mark the *exact date* of the transaction, with which the history contained in this document commences; to specify the precise time of the grand event, to which the whole history relates. So that, if there were any one sentence in the entire, in which the transcriber might be supposed completely secured against the danger of mistake, it must be this. It was the first; and it was the most important.

The historian says, as *Mr. Belsham* informs us, that it was in the days of *Herod the* TETRARCH OF GALILEE, that John began to baptize. The transcriber, as *Mr. Belsham* also informs us, has, by an error of his pen, fixed this event in the days of *Herod the* KING OF JUDEA. And the same critic, who informs us of these two things, at the same time assigns what affords a reason for the carelessness, that could have led to this error. For, he adds, (as we see above,) that no child who was taught to read could mistake Herod the king, OR (for he is very desirous to confound them) Tetrarch of Galilee, who was living at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, for *that* Herod, who died in the reign of Augustus, and who was the father of Herod the Tetrarch. Here, then, we have an excuse for the transcriber. He must have been perfectly at ease upon the subject. It must be a matter of indifference, whether he wrote *Tetrarch of Galilee*, or *King of Judea;* because *any child* could correct the error. The event would itself determine the date; contrary to what we have been weakly supposing in this note, that the date was intended to determine the event.

[a] In truth there is a solution of the problem, that reduces somewhat the extravagance of the blunder; and although it must still leave the result, fatal to the authority of this *Ebionite* document, from the grossness of the anachronism which cannot be done away; yet it affords some slight apology for the lapse, in addition to that which distance from the date of the event so obviously supplies. But I leave it to the

great, that it is *impossible* it ever could have been made: and so, the *two slips* of the transcriber's pen come in, aided by the *great similitude* between the words *JUDEA* and *GALILEE*, and between the words *KING* and *TETRARCH*.

But, what will the *Editors* and their *Calm Inquirer* say, if I produce them an instance, of this *impossible blunder* having been *actually* made, two hundred years before the time, at which we have any proof of the existence of the *Ebionite* gospel, in which this passage is found: and this, not by a *child who had not yet learned to read*, but by a *great philosopher*, of whose arguments, or rather of whose blasphemous sneers, against the divinity of our Lord, our Unitarian critics have not unfrequently availed themselves; and by a philosopher, who had called to his aid the most learned Jews of his time to enable him to compose his *True Word*, in opposition to the gospel. I mean no less a person than the celebrated CELSUS; who, whatever the illiberal orthodox may think of him, will surely not rank low in the opinion of such Unitarians as the *Editors* and the *Calm Inquirer;* and who, it is to be presumed, the modesty of these gentlemen will lead them to admit, possessed more of knowledge and talents than they can collectively lay claim to. Now come we to the IMPOSSIBLE BLUNDER.

"It was given out by Jesus, that Chaldeans were moved at the time of his birth, to come and worship him as a God, when he was but a little child, and that this was told to HEROD THE TETRARCH (ΗΡΩΔΗ ΤΩ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΗ τοῦτο δεδηλωκέναι,) who issued out an order to have all killed," &c. What is *Lardner's* remark upon this? See his *Works*, vol. viii. p. 21, where the reader, who may not have *Origen's* book to refer to, will find the passage here quoted. This learned writer, and truly *Calm Inquirer*, whose errors even can never do away the respect that is due to the man, thus observes, "I

admirers of these *Ebionite* compilers, to make the discovery of what may tend, in some degree, to repair the credit of their favourites; although it cannot set up the authority of their document.

would here make two remarks upon *Celsus* mistaking (Herod) KING OF ALL JUDEA, in whose time Jesus was born, for his son Herod, THE TETRARCH OF GALILEE. First, we see the great difficulty, of *any writer's* taking upon himself the character of a more early age than that in which he lives, without committing some great mistakes."—"Secondly, since *so learned a man* as CELSUS, about the *middle of the second century*, has made *such a blunder* in history, the Christian writers of the same age or later ought not to be too severely treated for any mistakes of the like kind."

I will now leave the *Editors*, and their *Calm Inquirer*, to settle the remainder of this subject with *Dr. Lardner:* on whom, of course, the charge of "*miserable sophistry*" must fall, if they be right. They say, that even a child, *provided* he had learnt to read, *could not* have made this blunder; and that it is an attempt to "impose upon" the reader by "miserable sophistry," to pretend that he could. *Dr. Lardner* says, that even a *learned philosopher*, not far removed from the time of Christ's birth, *could* make such a blunder, and assigns for the assertion no other reason, than that such a person *has* made it.

It must be confessed, indeed, that *Celsus* has made some *other* blunders; which may, to the Unitarian critics, with whom we are concerned, appear to the full as objectionable, as that which we have just noticed: so that, from the repetition of his blunders, they may be led to object to him as a fair example on the present question. The blunders, to which I allude, are his references to the accounts of the miraculous conception, contained in the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke; which would, of themselves, be sufficient to establish the early and unquestioned existence of those chapters. This is a species of blunder, which these Unitarian critics cannot easily forgive. We have already at pp. 87—89 of this volume, observed upon the evidence, derived from *Celsus*, to St. Matthew's narrative of the miraculous conception. The confirmation, which he affords to that contained in St. Luke's Gospel, may be seen in *Lardner;* to whose *Works* (vol. viii. pp. 6—68) I refer the

reader for full satisfaction concerning the value and extent of the hostile testimony of *Celsus*.

Two or three points, of those adverted to in the REMARKS ON THE UNITARIAN VERSION, yet remain to be noticed, together with the observations, which have been made upon these by the *Editors* through their *Calm Inquirer*. The points alluded to are to be found at pp. 81—87, of this volume. These sheets, however, have already so far exceeded the intended bounds, as necessarily to preclude the further prosecution of this subject at present. But I am induced to regret this the less, because I conceive it to be desirable to present the whole of the animadversions upon the *Unitarians*, and their *New Version*, in one collective form, and in a separate tract, in which I shall have it in my power to enter more largely into the subject, than was practicable in the present work. For that tract I shall reserve what remains to be offered on the points to which I have alluded. Of these, the principal relates to the objection, raised by the *Editors*, on the ground of St. Luke's report of our Lord's age in the 15th of Tiberius, against the genuineness of the evangelical narratives of the miraculous conception. The examination of this topic is now the more important, as the chronological contradiction, which is here contended for, has, in truth, become the forlorn hope of the *Editors*. From the arguments against the introductory chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, derived from the pretended *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* copies of these Gospels, they appear to have been for some time gradually receding, if we may judge from *Mr. Belsham's* answer to *Bishop Burgess's Brief Memorial*, and other of their recent publications. In these, they seem to be preparing for themselves a retreat from the old favourite ground of the *Ebionites* and *Marcion:* and I cannot avoid indulging in the hope, that what has been offered in these pages will not tend in any degree to retard this retrograde movement. Now, as to the fastness to which they seem resolved to retire, for the purpose of making their last stand, I do not mean to take to myself much credit, and I trust it will hereafter appear that

I make no boast, when I say, that I shall not find much trouble in dispossessing them of that. In truth, I must confess, that these critics have themselves supplied me with some aid towards the accomplishment of this object: insomuch that I am sanguine enough to expect, not only that I shall satisfy my reader of the truth of my positions, at pages 82 and 83 of this volume,—that the Editors have in their reference to *Lardner* confounded the true with the vulgar era of the nativity; and that they "have adduced the authority of *Lardner's* name in behalf of a position which *Lardner* has most triumphantly overthrown,"—but, that I shall also convince him, that even the very showing of the *Editors* and their *Calm Inquirer* supplies sufficient data to evince, that St. Luke does not contradict the alleged date of our Lord's birth, as given in either of the narratives of the miraculous conception. And thus, by the arithmetical aid of the Unitarians themselves, I hope to be enabled to prove, even to their own satisfaction, that the contradiction of dates, which (as they tell us) has *compelled* them to reject four chapters out of the received canon of the gospels, does not exist; and that, therefore, they may, without the smallest offence to that *delicacy of conscience* which led them to reject these chapters, now replace them, fairly printed and stripped of their Italic stigma, in their new translation.—I trust, also, that, in return for the aid thus bestowed by the Unitarian *Editors*, in clearing the character of the gospels from the alleged appearance of chronological inconsistency respecting the birth of Christ, I shall have it in my power to render them some compensation, on another head, already remarked upon at pages 83 and 84 of this volume; by showing, that when they spoke of *Ephrem Syrus*, as "*a writer of some note in the sixth century*," they had better ground for the assertion than has been generally supposed: so that, if they did fall into any confusion respecting this ancient writer, it was a confusion arising (at all events) out of a certain degree of knowledge; and the mistake is, therefore, not to be charged to that utter *carelessness*, which the *Calm Inquirer* would impute to the

Editors, when he attributes it (as he has done in his *Address*, at p. 14) to a mere "slip of the pen, or error of the press." The *Editors*, it will appear, have not been *quite* so thoughtless and negligent, as their own vindicator would represent them to have been, in preparing their *great work* for the public eye. The discussion of these, and other points, connected with the subject-matter of the *Remarks*, I expect soon to commit to the press. In the mean time, I comfort myself with the hope, that what has been already submitted, in this volume, will tend to throw some further light upon the nature of the Unitarian Version of the New Testament; upon the true character of modern Unitarians; and upon that of their system, and of the plans adopted for its promotion. And here, as I have done before, I must beg to be understood by my reader, as speaking of the *Unitarians* and their system, in reference to the description given of those who bear that name, by their chief advocate, *Mr. Belsham*. On all occasions, he professes to represent their sentiments; and, in that representation, the Body seem generally to acquiesce. To those who correspond not to *Mr. Belsham's* description, my observations are, of course, not intended to apply: and all such, who, individually, may feel cause to complain of the justness of those observations, as directed against Unitarians generally, must cast the blame upon him who has given them application, not upon him by whom they have been but conditionally pronounced. Opinions, shocking to every pious mind, revolting to every well informed understanding, essentially repugnant to Christian doctrines, and essentially subversive of Christian principles, have been promulgated by *Mr. Belsham*, and a few other individuals. These opinions I have laboured to expose; and have not scrupled, in strong terms, (though in terms very inadequate indeed,) to condemn. *Mr. Belsham* pronounces such to be the opinions of those whom he entitles *Unitarians*. It is for all, who do not maintain such opinions, to disclaim this title. Some, whom *Mr. Belsham* and his associates have so denominated, have already declined the honour intended for them in rank-

ing them of this class. And I rejoice to have it in my power to announce, with respect to this island, that the imputation of Unitarianism has been disclaimed for the whole: and this, by an authority unquestionable on such a subject; the authority of a gentleman of distinguished respectability, who ranks high amongst the dissenting ministry of Ireland, and whose perfect acquaintance with the state of the Dissenters throughout this country gives to his testimony in matters connected with the concerns of that body a decisive weight. From the testimony of this gentleman we learn, that there is *not one Unitarian congregation in Ireland.* I subjoin the letter[a] of *Dr. Bruce*, which announces a fact that must be so

[a] The letter of *Dr. Bruce*, above referred to, was addressed to the Editor of the *Monthly Repository*, in consequence of an article which had previously appeared in that Unitarian Journal on the subject of "IRISH UNITARIANS." This article had exultingly announced the flourishing state of Unitarianism in Ireland; and had enumerated several ministers and congregations, decidedly Unitarian, throughout the island. The letter, dated from Belfast, June 10, 1813, is as follows:—"Sir,—When looking into your Repository for Dec. 1812, [vii. 753,] I find my name introduced in a manner liable to misconception. It is one of those instances in which your readers are often misled by the usurpation of the title of Unitarians on the part of the Socinians. This is a continual source of confusion in your publication, and sometimes exposes it to the suspicion of disingenuity. As I accept of the denomination of Arian without subscribing to the creed of Arius, I shall take the liberty of addressing you as a Socinian, without insinuating that you adopt any opinions of Socinus which you disavow. The confusion arising from this equivocal use of the word Unitarian appeared of late very remarkable in your American correspondence: and, as you candidly corrected that misrepresentation with respect to America, I hope you will not refuse a speedy insertion of what I have to say concerning Ireland. I have a very general knowledge of the Dissenters of this country; and can venture to assert, that there is not one Socinian congregation in Ireland. In the Southern Association, one or two ministers and about a dozen of the laity may entertain such sentiments. In the Northern counties, which contain between 400,000 and 500,000 Presbyterians, including Seceders, I do not know of one minister who denies the pre-existence of our Lord, though I am intimately acquainted and connected with the most liberal divines of that body. The Methodists, Covenanters, Moravians, and Evangelical Societies, cannot be suspected of Socinianism: and the Quakers have of late been anxious to disclaim that doctrine."

Dr. Bruce, after noticing by name certain dissenting ministers, for the purpose of vindicating them from the imputation of Unitarianism, cast upon them in the article on which he animadverts, thus proceeds: — "The excessive spirit of proselytism, which actuates so many of your correspondents, is not always confined to the living. It is a favourite opinion among them, that Newton and Locke were Socinians. The evidence for this is brought forward in your Number for July, 1810,

gratifying to every Christian mind: and this I do, not merely for the purpose of showing that this country, happily, still

though, I think, little to the satisfaction of the writer himself. Sir Isaac Newton is claimed on the strength of *verbal* expressions, which he is said to have used to a Mr. Haynes. For the truth of this we are referred to a Mr. Baron, himself a Socinian, who says, that Mr. Haynes, from whom he had it, was the most zealous Socinian he ever knew; and therefore surely not an unexceptionable witness. For this quotation from Mr. Baron's tract, we are again referred to Mr. Lindsey's apology. This is slight ground for forming an opinion of the sentiments of so great a man, who wrote so largely on religion. As to the quotation from Sir Isaac's own writings, it might as well come from an Arian, or indeed from any Protestant, as from a Socinian." *Dr. Bruce* then proceeds, in considerable detail, and with unanswerable force of argument and evidence, to rescue the name of *Locke* from the stigma of Socinianism. He shows, not only that his explications of Scripture are inconsistent with the charge, but that he has himself in the strongest terms denied and repelled it: and he concludes his observations upon this subject, by pointing out Locke's manifest opposition to "modern Socinians on almost every article of their creed." For example, "He did not believe Christ to have been a mortal man of the seed of Adam; he was neither a necessarian nor a materialist: he believed in the incarnation and miraculous conception, and in the separate nature and existence of the soul and body of Christ, and did not scruple to use the phrase, 'for the sake of Jesus Christ.'" (*Monthly Rep.* vol. viii. pp. 515—517.)

I regret, that space does not permit me to lay before the reader the whole of *Dr. Bruce's* excellent observations upon this head. Joined with those of *Bishop Burgess*, and the remarks on the same point to be found in other parts of these pages, they supply what to every candid mind must appear demonstration, that *Locke's* opinions were as far removed from those of the Unitarians, as the East is from the West. Before I advert to other points connected with the subject of this letter, it may be expedient to apprize the reader, that *Dr. Priestley*, the great patriarch of modern Socinianism, maintained that there was "no more reason why a *man* should be supposed to have an immaterial principle within him, than a *dog:*" and, therefore, from his total rejection of "the doctrine of a soul," he inferred "the divinity and the pre-existence of Christ" to be "contrary to reason." (See *Tracts in controv. with Horsley*, pp. 18, 19.) This will explain the force of *Dr. Bruce's* observation in the clause preceding the conclusion of the passage last quoted from his letter.

I must subjoin a few words, here, to what Dr. Bruce has said upon this plan of *posthumous proselytism* (I may call it) lately adopted by the Unitarians. In addition to the names of *Locke* and *Newton*, they have been extremely anxious to claim that of *Clarke*, under various pretences. *Bishop Burgess* has abundantly shown (in his *Postscript* to *the Bible*, &c.) how little reason there is for ascribing to *Dr. Clarke* the Socinianised Liturgy, on which the Unitarians ground their right to associate him with the favourers of Unitarian principles.—I have just seen a publication of *Dr. Mant's*, in which additional light is thrown upon this subject. See the preface to his *Academical Sermons*. It is, fortunately, not necessary to adduce, from *Dr. Clarke's* writings, proofs of his *Anti-Socinianism*, with which they abound. *Dr. Lardner* has saved us that trouble. In his *Letter on the Logos*, in which he exerts himself to the utmost in the cause of Unitarianism, he asserts of *Dr. Clarke*, that he "cannot forbear saying, that his interpretations of texts,

remains uninfected by the poison of the Socinian or Unitarian heresy, and still enjoys that freedom from a pernicious

are *generally false*, arising, as from other causes, so particularly from *an aversion to Sabellian or Socinian senses.*" (*Works*, vol. xi. p. 112.) So much for *Dr. Clarke's* Socinian tendencies and Socinian Liturgy.

The attempt on the memory of *Dr. Watts* is, if possible, still more flagrant than any other instance of the Socinian exhumation of distinguished persons, who had lived and died in a Christian faith. In defiance of every existing production of *Dr. Watts's* pen, in defiance of the most established notoriety as to his religious opinions, and in defiance of the testimony of those with whom he lived in daily and hourly intercourse, the Unitarians are now labouring to associate with their cause the name of that excellent and exalted Christian. It is in vain that proof is heaped upon proof; and that *Mr. Palmer* has lately adduced evidence, rationally irresistible, to show that *Dr. Watts's* opinions remained through life opposed to every doctrine of a Socinian bearing; still it is contended, that, though *not Socinian*, and although, as *Mr. Belsham* admits, "he would, to the latest day of his life, have started from the imputation with horror;" that is, although he would have started with horror from the idea of admitting, or being supposed to admit, the mere human nature of Christ,—yet he might be a *UNITARIAN*, (which shows the *very convenient* use of this title,) and that although no written expressions of his can be produced, which favour *Unitarianism*, yet his last *THOUGHTS* were undoubtedly *Unitarian*. And thus is rudely, violently, and falsely, pressed into the service of the *worst form of the Socinian heresy*, the name of a man, who, it is admitted, would have started with horror from the imputation of a *Socinian* belief. In *Mr. Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey*, the reader will find all that can be urged on the Unitarian side of the question respecting *Dr. Watts's* opinions: and, in *Mr. Palmer's* Tract, entitled, *Dr. Watts no Socinian*, he will find the complete refutation of *Mr. Belsham's* arguments: and he will be the more confirmed in the admission of the completeness of that refutation, by the attempts which are made to answer it in the eighth vol. of the *Monthly Repository*; in which it appears, that, as in the case of Sir Isaac Newton, it is on the report made by a *Socinian* witness, of matter which cannot be produced, that the whole charge of *Dr. Watts's* Socinianism exclusively rests. A *Mr. Baron* was *told*, by a *Mr. Haynes*, (both zealous Unitarians,) that he (*Mr. Haynes*) had heard from *Sir Isaac Newton* (what it does not appear that any other human being had ever heard from him) expressions indicating a disbelief of our Lord's *pre-existence*. And *Dr. Lardner* was *told* by a *Mr. Neal*, (both zealous Unitarians likewise,) that he (*Mr. Neal*) had heard from *Dr. Watts*, expressions indicative of certain *Unitarian* (*THOUGH ADMITTED TO BE ANTI-SOCINIAN*) sentiments: and, yet farther, that he had heard these expressions from *Dr. Watts*, in the presence of his friends of the family in which he resided, who "were greatly concerned to hear him talk" thus, (*Belsh. Mem. of Lindsey*, p. 220,) and who yet, at the same time, it appears *never heard* these conversations, as we find it admitted in *Month Rep.* vol. viii. pp. 716. 721. More proofs, we are assured, also, we should have, but that the above named Unitarians burned the papers of *Dr. Watts*, which would have established the evidence of his Unitarianism. One paper has, fortunately, remained, of which *Mr. Belsham* quotes a part, omitting *that* part of it which proves *Dr. Watts* to be the direct opposite of that which he labours to represent him.

But, there is something *still* more

contagion, on which, fifteen years ago, I offered my congratulations to the public, in the first impression of this

indefensible in the treatment of *Dr. Watts*, which remains to be noticed. It is well known, that a collection of hymns, by *Dr. Watts*, for the use of children, had obtained the most widely extended circulation in all schools and places of instruction for the young. These hymns, it is also well known, are calculated to convey to the young mind the *strictest* notions of *Orthodox* Christianity. They who had dived into *Dr. Watts's* last *thoughts*, and had discovered the secret which *Dr. Watts* had so carefully concealed from all the world beside, (and indeed, as *Mr. Belsham* seems to say, even from himself,) namely, that he was a *Socinian*, have thought it right, as he had not himself made any corresponding alteration in his hymns, to make such an alteration for him; and have accordingly *Socinianised* throughout those beautiful divine songs, which, until tainted by this foul contact, had breathed the purest spirit of Christian piety, regulated by Christian doctrine. Thus, *Dr. Watts* is now made to speak from the mouths of children, in language, which takes from our blessed Saviour all those attributes, the habitual clothing him with which, in the young imagination, was the great object that he had laboured to effect. But this dishonest use of *Watts's* name, for the corruption of the infant mind, is not the only thing to be complained of. That alterations had been made in those hymns was, I believe, generally announced, in the published collections that had undergone this change: at the same time, that, from the intimation that the variations were but slight, and from the ignorance of the greater number of purchasers, (who, finding *Dr. Watts's* name annexed, would still receive them under the authority of that name,) the notice of the change was not likely to oppose any very material impediment to the influential operation of the name of *Watts* appearing on the title-page of the collection. Still, however, it might be *said*, that notice was given that the hymns were altered: and again, it might be pretended, as in the case of Archbishop Newcome, that justice demanded, that acknowledgment should be made, openly, in the title-page, of the author of the original work, from which this altered publication was principally derived. Let all this weigh, as so many words, to those, whom mere words content. They, who seek something beyond sounds, may not feel perfect satisfaction. At all events, it must be admitted, that common honesty demanded that it should be announced, not only that alterations were made, but *by whom* they were made, by what denomination of sect; in order that the public might be fairly apprized of the character of those alterations. This, however, it is manifest, would have defeated the object. But, to pass this over, what will be said to the following fact? I have this moment lying before me a printed copy of a collection of the hymns with this title-page:—"Dr. Watts's Divine and Moral Songs for Children: revised and altered so as to render them of general use: To which are added, a short Catechism and Prayers. By Mrs. Trimmer." Now, that *Mrs. Trimmer* was a decided Trinitarian, in the strictest sense of the word, and that her opinions were in complete unison with the doctrines of the Established Church, is known to all who have the least acquaintance with her history and writings. The general notoriety on this head will be found to be fully verified by authentic details at pp. 91. 120. 152. 241. of the first volume of the *Account of her Life*, &c., lately published. The page last specified, indeed, evinces her habitual horror of the Socinian or Unitarian opinions. "I am grieved to see, by the Reviews, that Unitarian books multiply continually. *I am afraid that*

work;—but, also, for the purpose of affording a decisive proof, that it requires not the feelings which belong to the

poison spreads itself. Oh! that I could furnish an antidote to it. Lord Jesus, convinced as I am of Thy Divinity, I am zealous to maintain it," &c. This is the writer, to whom the adaptation of *Dr. Watts's* Hymns to general use is ascribed, together with a short catechism and prayers; all these, at the same time, executed by a Socinian pen; every sentiment, which savoured of those great Christian doctrines, which both *Dr. Watts* and *Mrs. Trimmer* deemed essential to Christianity, carefully expunged: and every artful insinuation of what both these writers would have viewed with abhorrence, as tending to supplant those doctrines, fraudulently introduced. I shall give a single specimen in one of the doxologies:—

"To God the Father, God the Son,
And God the Spirit, Three in One;
Be honour, praise, and glory, given,
By all on earth, and all in heaven."
Dr. Watts.

The Socinian equivalent of this doxology, ascribed to *Mrs. Trimmer*, is as follows:—

"Praise to our gracious God be given,
By all on earth and all in heaven;
Here would we celebrate his love,
Until we join the host above."

With the like *fidelity* the hymns at large are presented to the public. A Socinian catechism of a most extraordinary structure is annexed. And all given as the joint production of DR. WATTS and MRS. TRIMMER, *for the use of children.* It is obvious, that the whole range of names, which the last century presents, could have furnished none by which free access to the nursery and the school-room could have been so readily and so extensively procured, as the very two names which have been here falsely assumed. That of *Mrs. Trimmer*, especially, (whatever special pleading there may be about the former, on the ground of a pretended change of opinions,) must be admitted to be a base and deliberate *fraud*:—a fraud practised upon the parent, to gain admission within his doors, under a false name, in order to corrupt the mind and heart of his child: kidnapping of the most atrocious description, by which is stolen away, not the person, but the immortal soul of the infant. Such are Unitarian practices! Such are the fruits of a system, founded in the adulteration of Scripture truth! They, who have falsified the word of God, cannot be expected to deal truly by the word of man. Deceptive titles, unfounded assertions, and false quotations, we have been familiarized with, as we have advanced in our acquaintance with Unitarians and their writings. But the reader could scarcely have been prepared for a fabrication, so unprincipled, and treacherous, as this. I shall dwell upon it no longer. DR. CLARKE'S *Book of Common Prayer:* DR. WATTS'S *Divine and Moral Songs:* the same *revised and altered by* MRS. TRIMMER: and ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S *Version of the New Testament,*—are all standing monuments of the truth and fair dealing of modern Unitarianism; and the names of *Newton, Locke, Clarke,* and *Watts,* illustrious remembrancers of the respect which its professors manifest for the true characters of the dead.

The bearing of the observation in *Dr. Bruce's* letter, relative to the "American Correspondence," deserves to be understood, as it tends to give still farther insight into the *management* of Unitarian concerns. A splendid account had been sent abroad, through Unitarian publications, in these countries, of the rapid and extensive progress of Unitarianism in *America.* The *Rev. Francis Parkman,* a congregational minister of *Boston,* in a well written communication to the principal publisher of this account, gave it a direct and unqualified contradiction, disclaiming Unitarianism

Clergy of the Establishment, to be disgusted with the disingenuous proceedings of *Unitarians*, with their false pre-

for *America*, as decisively as *Dr. Bruce* has done for *Ireland;* and in terms still more emphatical. This gentleman, though in friendly intercourse with the leading Unitarians of England, and, equally with them, removed from all connexion with the Episcopal Church, concludes his letter on the above subject with these words:—"I only wished to show, as I trust I have done without offence, that in *Boston* in *New England*, and *in America at large*, WE ARE NOT, and, permit me to add, *as long as we study the Scriptures*, I believe WE SHALL NOT, become converts to your NEW DOCTRINE." (*Monthly Rep.* vol. vii. p. 265.) The reply made to this was, that the writer mistook altogether the meaning of the word UNITARIAN: that it did *not* mean the same as HUMANITARIAN, (such as *Dr. Priestley*, *Mr. Belsham*, &c.,) but that it extended to all who were NOT *Trinitarians;* and therefore included (with this exception) those who *opposed* the doctrine of the *simple humanity* of Christ, as well as those who maintained it: and to wind up all, comically enough assured this reverend gentleman, that he was *himself* an UNITARIAN *without knowing it.* The *American Correspondent* had declared, for himself, and those of his brethren who might be supposed to approach nearest to UNITARIANS, that they, "holding high and exalted views of the personal mediation of Christ, resting on the merits of his atonement, his cross and passion, and zealous to pay the honour due to his name, would, consequently, be very unwilling to be confounded with the followers of Dr. Priestley." (Ibid. p. 201.) But, being now assured, that *none* of these things stood in the way of their taking the name which was proffered to them: that, provided they were *not Trinitarians*, they were *Unitarians;* found, all of a sudden, that he and several of his brethren were, as his English correspondent had pronounced, UNITARIANS, *without knowing it.* They could not travel to the name, but the the name had travelled to them: and, therefore, in a letter sent to the *Editor* of the Unitarian Magazine, (with the express condition, by the way, that it should *not* be published, and which the *Editor accordingly* published without delay,) he apologizes for having spoken so strongly against Unitarians, now that he finds that *Unitarians* may hold opinions directly *opposite* to those which characterize the followers of *Priestley.* And thus, *Unitarianism* is now said to flourish in *America;* where, in the true sense of the word, as it is applied by the modern *Socinians*, it appears, that there are scarcely any *Unitarians* to be found. They, who would wish to see the most curious specimen of a contrivance, whereby may be enlisted into a class a multitude of persons, by whom that class is directly opposed, will be not a little amused, by tracing the history of this transaction to which I have here alluded, through pp. 198—201. 264, 265. 498—501. of vol. vii., and pp. 478—480. of vol. viii. of the *Monthly Repository.*

Some very interesting information, concerning the endeavours to introduce *Unitarianism* (that is, *modern Socinianism*) into America, and the bad success of those endeavours, will be found in an Extract from the *Panoplist* of *Dr. Morse*, entitled *Socinianism Unmasked*, which has lately been published in London. This work was occasioned by *Mr. Belsham's* unfounded representation of the progress of *Unitarianism* in *America*, and, besides much valuable matter upon the immediate subject, it contains some curious facts concerning *Dr. Priestley* whilst in that country. We learn from it, that the exercise of *Dr. Priestley's* ministry, in the *United States*, was attended with scarcely any effect; and we are put in possession of an extraordinary observa-

tences as to the extent of their numbers, their unfounded association of distinguished names, and their dishonest use of an equivocal appellation. The Unitarian boast of the progress of their cause in Ireland is, as we have seen, completely put down by the plain fact, that *not a single Unitarian congregation exists throughout the island.* Similar boasting, as to America, has been sent abroad through Unitarian magazines, pamphlets, and sermons: but that this is nearly as unfounded as the former, there is good reason to think, from the authenticated contradictions which have reached these countries from America, as well as from the confessions since made upon this head by the Unitarians themselves. To Great Britain alone, the success of the Unitarian cause, to whatever that success may amount, is exclusively confined. And the appearance of progress, which is ostentatiously held out within this range, may, after all, be more justly considered as an illusion, growing from the noise and bustle of a few, than as marking a real extension of the numbers of the sect. The reports of such extension, with which their monthly magazines are stuffed, are most of them manifest exaggerations; and some of them are absolutely ludicrous. We have not merely clubs, and speeches, and dinner meetings, and toasts, to promote and celebrate the spread of the Unitarian cause, and *ladies* assisting at these seemly celebrations,

tion, made by him, in a letter to *Mr. Lindsey*, concerning *Mr. Jefferson*, of whom he uses these words: "He is generally considered as an unbeliever: if so, however, HE CANNOT BE FAR FROM US." (pp. 41. 47.) It appears, also, from this pamphlet, that our *English Unitarians* have been active at least in putting forward their publications in *America;* and that, among these, their *New Version* is included. It is matter of satisfaction to find that works of another description, and which, it is hoped, will counteract the mischief, have found their way into that country, without the efforts of a party. The writings of *Dr. Middleton* and *Dr. Wardlaw* are there in extensive circulation: and it is nearly three years since I received, from *Mr. Eastburn*, of *New York*, a remarkably well printed copy of the third edition of this work, which that gentleman had of his own motion published in that city. Upon the whole, it is to be hoped, that *America* will remain, as *Ireland* has done, free from the taint of this most unchristian heresy: and, that, however liberal the heads of this heresy may be, in bestowing the title of *Unitarian*, like the honorary one of LL. D., in both countries, it will be long before they find any real graduates of the school of *Belsham* and *Gilchrist* in either.

but we have, in their monthly enumeration of Unitarian congregations, accounts of some, composed of a number of individuals so scanty, that, to call the assemblage a *congregation*, is an application of the term altogether ridiculous. We have even, on one occasion, the exulting detail of a *single individual*[a], determining to raise a temple to the Unitarian worship, and actually erecting himself into a Unitarian congregation; contriving, at the same time, to satisfy literally the Scripture phrase of "*two or three assembled together*," by borrowing, from a distance, the attendance of *two other* Unitarians, for the occasion of the meeting.

The grand object of the Unitarians, at present, is *proselytism*. The increase of their numbers, whether that increase be real or apparent, whether it be an extension of the principle, or only of the name, is now the point to which all their exertions are directed. The apparent, they think, will work the real. And for this purpose nothing could be better contrived, than the equivocal application of the title[b] which they

[a] The account of this transaction will be found at p. 518 of vol. ix. of the *Monthly Repository*. It is given by the solitary agent, in this transaction, himself. *Southampton*, no very small town, is the place, where, he says, he could not find a *single Unitarian* beside himself: notwithstanding which, he resolved upon a Unitarian "temple," and a Unitarian congregation. The two Unitarians, whom he drew to him, one from *Southen* and another from *Rumsey*, made him feel comfortable, however, on the latter point; because, "he recollected the encouragement of our great Master, that, 'where TWO OR THREE are gathered together' in support of his cause, he has promised his assistance."—This gentleman has, it must be confessed, shown greater honesty, in his quotation from the Gospel, than many Unitarian teachers are used to do, who are attended by larger congregations. He knew that, in the true sense of the word, *his* two or three could not be said to be gathered together, *in the name of Christ* (*two or three are gathered together* IN MY NAME,) and therefore that part of our Lord's words he very properly omitted.

[b] The degree to which the equivocation, in the use of this title, has been carried, may be best understood from a controversy which has lately arisen among the *Unitarians* themselves; and which is to be found in the tenth volume of their *Monthly Repository*, (the volume for the year 1815,) at pages 226. 278. 354, 355. 416. 475. 479. 483. 552. 554, 555. 585. 590. 637, 638, 639. 709, 710. 743, 744, 745. I have been thus particular, in tracing out the whole field of the controversy, because nothing can more clearly manifest the true character and designs of the sect, than this domestic discussion which has taken place within its pale. And, I can assure the reader, who is desirous to ascertain the genuine objects of *modern Unitarians*, that, in this view, he will find himself fully compensated for his trouble in travelling through the entire range,

have assumed. To those who are to be initiated, the term *Unitarian* is presented, as merely denoting all who are *not*

which I have here marked out for his inspection. Some extracts from the more important parts of this controversy I shall here subjoin.

Mr. Belsham, at page 34 of his *Letters to the Bishop of London*, (intended as a reply to certain observations upon Unitarianism, contained in one of the most luminous, comprehensive, and dignified pastoral discourses, that have at any time issued from the Episcopal chair,) had asserted *for* the UNITARIANS, that that they "*reject* the doctrine of the *Trinity*, of the *creation of the Universe by Jesus Christ*, of the *incarnation*, of the *atonement*, of *original sin*, and OTHER *popular doctrines* connected with these."—To this CREED (of special *disbelief*) laid down for UNTARIANS, by *Mr. Belsham*, it was immediately objected, on the part of that body at large, that, their fundamental principle being "that there is only one God, the Father," they are grossly misrepresented by *Mr. Belsham*, in fastening upon them a *creed*, expressing a rejection of doctrines, *every one of which, except that of the Trinity*, is received by some among them: insomuch "that, if, from the body of *Unitarians* were to be excluded all those who do not believe according to *Mr. Belsham's* negative creed, he would be left in a very inconsiderable minority." The advocate, who thus maintained the unrestricted principle of Unitarianism, and whose education and habits of science gave him a decided superiority in precision and reasoning over the opponent with whom he had to contend, proceeds very justly to demand,—"why should we, who object to the creeds of our brother Christians, make ourselves exclusive creeds?" And, at the same time that he fully admits *Mr. Belsham's* absolute right to state *his own* creed, he totally denies his right to state it *as the creed of Unitarians:* and, finally, in the name of the *Unitarian body*, he "protests against such an imposition of articles of faith," as being both unauthorized and unfounded. *Mr. Belsham*, in reply, condemns the vague use of the word *Unitarian* in modern practice; it being employed (as he says) to express every class of religionists from the *Athanasian* down to the *Mahometan;* and, assuming the high tone of authority, and fortifying himself by the sanction of *Lardner*, *Priestley*, and *Lindsey*, without condescending to reason upon the subject, he declares his *determination* to apply the term in no other than in the restricted sense, which he had already ascribed to it. This authoritative style of *Mr. Belsham* is met by his spirited opponent, as might be expected, with much indignation. After pointing out, that the consequence of such usurpation of authority, on the part of *Mr. Belsham*, must be that others would, in like manner, from time to time, with equal right, impose new articles of belief, until, at last, the *Unitarian*, instead of having one simple article of belief, would be lost in the complication of his own creed; he concludes with declaring, that, if to be a *Unitarian*, it is necessary to adopt the creed laid down by *Mr. Belsham*, he must give up his pretensions to be called by that name; and hints, with much emphasis, that in this act he would be very far from being singular. *Mr. Belsham*, in reply, still stands upon the high ground of "sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas;" contends for the propriety of the restricted sense; abuses the *Arians;* and thinks it best that there should be a separation of the staunch followers of *his* opinions from the other classes of Unitarians; for that, otherwise, the conducting Society may send out missionaries of opposite complexions, who may defeat each other's views and doctrines. It is again pressed upon *Mr. Belsham*, that he has no right to require the adoption of *his* creed, which is emi-

Trinitarian; that is, as these expression, *not Athanasian.*

nently defective in important points of Christian belief: that the rejection of certain doctrines, which is required by *Mr. Belsham,* in a *Unitarian,* is not requisite to qualify for that denomination; but that many, who hold those doctrines, are as well entitled to the name, as *Mr. Belsham* himself. *Mr. Belsham,* now, *calmly* rejoins, that he merely meant to give his *definition* of *Unitarian;* that others were at equal liberty to give theirs: and so begs leave to withdraw from the contest. His opponent, however, justly rebukes him for confounding "definition" with "assertion:" and concludes with stating that, at all events, it is requisite for him to announce, that he is not of *that* class of Unitarians to which *Mr. Belsham* belongs; for that he approaches much nearer to the *Arians,* whom *Mr. B.* had abused, than he does to *Mr. Belsham* himself; with whom he never can concur in his "opinions of the office and character of our Saviour."—Indeed, these last words distinguish the writer who uses them, very widely from *Unitarians* of *Mr. Belsham's* class. The *very sound of them is Christian.* [But this same writer had, already, most honourably for himself, drawn a broad line of distinction between himself and such Unitarians as *Mr. Belsham,* in what he had stated on the subject of *Atonement* in the same volume of the *Monthly Repository:* and which, there is good reason to think, had the effect of deterring the conductors of that journal from carrying forward the discussion on that subject, although, as I have before had occasion to observe, (see page 146 of this volume,) it was announced, that this important subject was to receive a lengthened and elaborate investigation in the succeeding numbers of the journal. It was found prudent very soon to desist. It was discovered to be a *dangerous* discussion.]

Whilst this controversy was going forward, another started up, in consequence of the apprehension excited, lest *Mr. Belsham's* attempt to narrow the meaning of the term *Unitarian* should injure the good cause. The term, it was allowed on all hands, had been used as a *generic* name, including various classes, *Arians, Socinians, Sabellians,* and, if not *Calvinists,* yet such as held even the doctrine of atonement in a qualified sense;—all, in short, who were *not* decided *Trinitarians.* It was contended, that it would be wise to continue it in this application, for that, hereby, those who differed from the believers in the simple humanity, being brought into contact with them, would, if these latter were not too hasty in urging matters forward, be *drawn* into the final adoption of their opinions. The term *Unitarian,* in short, is recommended to be continued, as it had been used, as a decoy; for which, from its general, and simple, and uninvidious application, it seemed so admirably fitted. It is emphatically urged, that it is quite *too soon* for the *Unitarians* to split into parties; that "they are too much like a rope of sand already;" and that, however they may differ in their opinions, they must hold together *as if* they agreed in one system, till "they have by union *cleared the world of the Trinitarian doctrine.*" At the same time, in order to satisfy such as were desirous of a *term* to distinguish those who hold the simple humanity of Christ, various titles are in succession proposed and rejected.—*Socinian, Humanitarian, Priestleyan,* have each their advocates. Thus it was supposed that all parties might be satisfied: *Unitarian* implying the general association, and the other terms indicating the particular creed.

But, in the desire to reconcile the contending parties, it was forgotten by the persons who proposed this plan of conciliation, that the whole value of the name *Unitarian* would by this means

gentlemen again explain this To all, then, who do not re-

ceive the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is laid down in the Athanasian creed, the title of *Unitarian* is, in the first in-

be lost: and, accordingly, a veteran, who saw his way more clearly than the rest, reccommends, that no such distinction of names should be at all admitted; but that the same word *Unitarian* should be applied to the entire aggregate, comprehending the various classes of dissentients from the doctrine of the Trinity, and also be used as the distinctive denomination for that particular class which rests on the simple humanity of Christ. To this the obvious objection was made, that the name of the entire genus cannot well designate exclusively any *one* of those species, to *all* of which it *equally* extends. This gentleman replies, that this is a peculiar case: that the name which designates *this* species best is the very name which belongs to it in common with all the others: and that, therefore, the *generic* name is here the fittest for the *specific* appellation. This must be admitted to be very new logic: but, at the same time, it is, undoubtedly, very old management. The ambiguity (which is the primary object) is hereby preserved: since the same term can now be extended to the many, or appropriated to the few, as occasion may require. The gentleman, who proposed this novel mode of conciliation, saw that the cause was in danger. There was reason to apprehend, that those links, which now bound together so many different classes firmly *against* ATHANASIUS, and which might ultimately draw them *to* MR. BELSHAM, would, by the great eagerness of this gentleman to place himself at the head of the Sect, be prematurely broken. He had, openly, and rashly, affirmed, that none could be considered as UNITARIANS, who did not accept his creed. He had, in other words, contended, that the name must be confined to one specific class; and he had, therefore, as the other classes were not yet prepared to allow themselves to be melted down into this one, and to receive him as their head, thrown off their co-operation, and reduced the boasted numbers of the *Unitarian* body to a contemptible few. How was this to be remedied? The name, *Mr. Belsham* contended, however generic it might have been hitherto considered, must be appropriated to the species. The conciliator replies, the generic name may still continue as such. But, whilst it is the true name for the *genus*, it is, on the same principle, best fitted to *particularise* this one *species*. And, thus, he both satisfies *Mr. Belsham*, by making it the *proper* appellation for *all who think with* HIM; and gives content to those of the general denomination, who will not accept *Mr. Belsham's* creed, by continuing it as the generic name for *all who do not think with* ATHANASIUS.

The ingenuity, by which this professed moderator of the contending parties, who had solely the interests of one in view, has contrived to reconcile two things apparently contradictory, can only be conceived by reading the letters of *Mr. Aspland*, in this controversy. The grand point, however, is now effected. Matters are again settled as before: and the term *Unitarian* is, now, for all the purposes of proselytism, at the same time restrictive and comprehensive, to any degree, that the managers of the term may require.—In truth, I cannot better represent the nature of this term, as it is now used, than by an illustration, which there is undoubtedly one Unitarian who will comprehend; but that, a Unitarian far removed from the class to which *Mr. Belsham* would confine the name; as he has proved, in the very controversy to which I have referred. It will be readily understood, and for obvious reasons, that I mean *Mr. Frend*. The illustration to which I allude, is derived from the lunar shadow: which, if the term be restricted to the direct cone, sends its darkening influence but to a small portion of the

stance, to be applied: and all such, of course, are hailed as brethren, and admitted within the pale of this honourable denomination. Then, as, from the spirit of party, the force of association, the influence of flattery, persuasion, and other co-operating causes, the initiated is led to make still farther advances, the entire scheme is gradually unfolded, and embraced; and the progressive convert is finally introduced into those interior regions, where Unitarians of full grown stature (such as *Mr. Belsham* and *Mr. Gilchrist*) properly reside; not, indeed, to what, with the Christian, may be deemed analogous to the "secretosque pios" of the poet; but to mansions separated by a wide gulf from all that belongs to Christianity. Thus we see, that it is not under the influence of the Papacy only, that the principle of Jesuitism —that of an artful and elastic accommodation, joined with the careful separation of esoteric and exoteric—is called into active operation at the present day. By such means, the judicious application of a *name* may be employed to give a real

earth's surface: but, if the expression be conceived to extend to the penumbral space, spreads its partial obscuration to a comparatively wide space indeed. In like manner, to the *Unitarian* in *Mr. Belsham's* more contracted use of the appellation, to whom, the whole Sun of righteousness is eclipsed, the range is proportionally contracted: but they, to whom, in a greater latitude of the term, different degrees of increasing illumination are transmitted, spread over a wider extent, and with the benefit of a progressively increasing irradiation, until, having passed the boundaries of partial obscuration, they emerge into bright and open day.

It ought to be observed, that in the course of this controversial discussion, among the various names suggested, for the class of Unitarians which forms the true nucleus of the body, and which is in truth the class to which the whole apparatus is adapted, I mean the class of such persons as *Mr. Belsham* and *Mr. Gilchrist*, the most adequate seems one which *Mr. Aspland* has adverted to, at p. 642 of the volume referred to,—viz. *Budneians*. This class of *Socinians* seems, in all general principles, to correspond most exactly with *Mr. Belsham's Unitarians*. Possibly, however, in minuter matters, they had not travelled sufficiently far. No objection however can possibly lie against the title of *Priestleyan*. And for the sake of clearness, I shall, in all future observations which I may be compelled to bestow upon this sect, designate them by no other. *Unitarian*, it is manifest by their own confession, no more discriminates the peculiar class which is the subject of our present remarks, than the word *Christian* discriminates any of the particular description of the believers, who call themselves after the name of Christ. I have, it will be allowed, sufficiently shown my desire to comply with their wishes, so far as a name was concerned, in having used it so long without scruple:—but now, since they have confessed the dishonest use they mean to make of it, I can use it no longer.

increase to the numbers of the sect. But, at all events, its apparent dimensions are widely dilated, by the extent of a signification, which is made to spread over all that lies between the boundaries of the strictest Trinitarianism, and of that open and ostentatious Deism, which rejects even the name of Christianity. With the Deist of this description the *Unitarian* prudently disclaims alliance; whilst, to the opponents of Revelation, who carry their faculties more discreetly, he affords a convenient shelter. And thus, by the contrivance of a name, a sect, which, in its true and real character, is, by the confession of its warmest friends [a], small and despised, and whose principles are equally offensive to sober piety and to sound intellect, but, above all, diametrically opposed to the Christian Scriptures, is made to appear (if we except the Trinitarian worshipper) co-extensive with the Christian name. Indeed, it might be a question, whether, as the Trinitarian is pronounced to be a polytheist, and therefore cannot properly be admitted within the pale of Christianity, the title CHRISTIAN might not be *appropriated* to

[a] "We are a sect few in number, unfashionable, unpopular, despised, hated, calumniated, everywhere spoken against," &c. *Letter to the Bishop of London, by T. Belsham*, p. 48.—This, of course, must be applied only to the genuine *Unitarians*, those of *Mr. Belsham's* own class, to whom he wishes to appropriate the name, as we have seen in the preceding note. For we know how magniloquently the same writer has enlarged upon the numbers, and weight, and consequence, and increased and increasing respectability of *Unitarians*, in numerous other passages of his writings. It was, however, *convenient*, here, to use, in plaintive accents, a language, which, although contradicted in terms by the same writer in other places, is undoubtedly the truth. How great are the advantages of a well chosen name! *Mr. Aspland*, in his warm recommendation of the continuance of the use of the word *Unitarian*, in that ambiguous sense in which it had already done so much good to the cause, very justly observes, from *Dr. South*, that "the generality of mankind is *wholly* and *absolutely* governed by *words* and *names*;" and that "he, who will set up for a skilful manager of the rabble, *so long as they have but ears to hear*, needs never inquire whether they have any understanding whereby to judge: but with two or three popular empty words, well tuned and humoured, may whistle them backwards and forwards, upwards and downwards, till he is weary; and get upon their backs when he is so." *Month. Rep.* vol. x. p. 481.—And what does *Mr. Aspland* deduce from all this? Why, neither more nor less than this,—that the name *Unitarian* must never be given up; but all possible changes rung upon it, let the opinions of those who bear that name be ever so various and contradictory.

those, who now call themselves *Unitarians;* and thus, they, who, in the true sense of the phrase, *deny Christ*, be pronounced the only persons who deserve to be *called after his name.*

But, besides the insidious use of a deceptive denomination, the powerful engines of *Societies* and *Missions* are also now brought into action. The efficacy of these, so abundantly evinced in the propagation of Methodism, the promoters of this new system are desirous to employ in the extension of theirs. At the late establishment of their general association in Scotland, they have announced the discovery[a], that "Union is strength." This discovery had been made and acted upon before, with considerable energy, both in Great Britain and Ireland, for the purpose of relieving the inhabitants of these free countries from the pressure of the British constitution. Societies are now, as then, to be formed

[a] See the account of the *General Association of Unitarians in Scotland*, at p. 390 of vol. x. of the *Monthly Repository*. The consolidation of force is the grand object. Every man to his post. This is the grand discovery of modern days for the subversion of Establishments, of whatever aspect, civil or religious. An extended organization, a compacting discipline, a rapid communication, and a combined movement: all this is said to be effective for the diffusion of *religious truth*. Whether it be effective for this purpose or not, there *are* purposes which it is admirably fitted to accomplish. "UNION IS STRENGTH." Undoubtedly. Acts of Parliament are not wanting to augment its force. The Unitarians are now labouring to prove, that they needed not that aid which the Legislature has lately, with so much magnanimity, bestowed upon them. The uses to be made of this consolidation of strength are now beginning to unfold themselves. The Unitarian Magazine for April, 1816, conveys a pretty significant hint of the value of the argument, to be derived from *numbers united in a common cause*. There indeed we find the circle widened. That of *Unitarianism* was felt to be too contracted, for the object to be embraced; which is neither more nor less, than the *Abolition of the Establishment*. For this, it is deemed requisite to combine into one grand phalanx the whole body of the *Dissenters*, of whatever denomination. Against the assaults of this mighty column, it is confidently asserted that the old bulwarks of the Constitution must give way. The Establishment is declared to be a grievance no longer to be borne. And the *Dissenters* are pronounced to have NOW attained such strength from their *numbers*, that it requires but one combined effort to throw off the antiquated encumbrance. *Petition*, indeed, is for form sake mentioned; and the *peculiar mode* of raising the revenues of the Church adverted to: but intimidation by force are the means pointed out; and the abolition of the Establishment the end proposed. "UNION IS STRENGTH." AND THE ESTABLISHMENT MUST FALL. *Delenda est Carthago.* See *Monthly Repository*, vol. xi. p. 207.

and combined together, in one general concert, but for a different object, that of banishing, not the name, indeed, but the reality of Christ's religion, out of a Christian land. It remains, at the same time, to be submitted to experiment, how far such an organized system will be employed, in repaying to the constitution, what it may succeed in taking from the religion of the country. The law has recently bestowed increased powers upon the Unitarian: it is to be presumed, that he will not employ these increased powers to reduce the strength of the law, however he may be disposed to employ them for the subversion of the national religion. At the same time it should always be carefully remembered by those whom these matters most concern, that one grand cause of hostility to the *Establishment* arises out of the fact of its forming a *part of the Constitution.*

But, again, not only is the face of the land to be covered with societies, bound together in one firm league; but missionaries are to be sent forth in all directions, to spread the opinions of this new sect. Here indeed is an extraordinary state of things. Missionaries to *teach* the truths of Christianity, we are well acquainted with: but missionaries to *unteach* them, are of a description rather unusual. Missionaries there have been, who have encountered much for the *love of Christ:* but that missionaries, *calling* themselves *Christian,* should go abroad to work the *rejection of his name,* is a singularity indeed. It is impossible to behold this portentous retroversion of religious zeal, without being recalled to the recollection of that first great mission, on which our Lord sent his disciples. We, there, see the devoted followers of Christ commissioned by him to go forth, and teach all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father* AND *of the Son* AND *of the Holy Ghost.* Here we see the followers of a different Lord, going forth to inculcate, as the one great maxim, which alone is worthy to be taught, that *there is no Son and no Holy Ghost. There* we see the disciples of our blessed Master receiving directions from him, to preach that gospel which *he* had given them. *Here* we see the mes-

sengers of another master directed to carry with them a *false gospel*, which, whilst it bears the name, shall more effectually subvert the doctrines of the true gospel of Christ. *There*, also, we find an authority conferred, to announce to mankind the gracious tidings of a *Redeemer*, through whom every one that *believeth shall be saved*. But, *here*, we find teachers directed to guard all against the danger of *belief;* and to enforce emphatically, as the most important truth, that *he alone shall be saved who believeth not*.

When it is considered that the modern Socinian (who calls himself Unitarian) is, under the name of Christian, the decided enemy of Christianity, and, under the guise of a translator of the New Testament, a deliberate falsifier of the Gospel, it may appear hardly necessary to offer an excuse for entering at any length, however great, into controversy with persons who would thus clandestinely steal from the Christian all that forms his consolation and his hope. But that, in these volumes, the immediate subject of which is the doctrine of the Atonement, this controversy should have been carried in the direction and to the extent to which it has travelled, may not unreasonably appear to demand explanation. It will be recollected by those who are acquainted with the writings of Dr. Priestley, and his fellow-labourers of that day, that the doctrine of the Atonement was that which they conceived to be the vitally distinguishing doctrine of the orthodox system: and, on looking back to pages 61—64 of the first volume of this work, it will be seen, that against this doctrine especially, as the foundation of all that he was pleased to call the corruptions of Christianity, the Father of modern Socinianism directed his most strenuous and persevering exertions. In this view of the case, the Author of these volumes was originally induced to engage in the vindication of this important doctrine, and in the discussion of the various objections which, by the united industry of Dr. Priestley and other Socinians, had been collected against it: naturally expecting that if he must be engaged in farther controversy with the followers of Priestley, it would be upon that ground which had thus been chosen by themselves. The matter, however, turns up differently. The question of Atonement is no longer made the subject of investigation by the modern Socinians: and now, after a lapse of fifteen years from the first publication of this work, it is openly (and it may be said, officially) announced, that the prosecution of the controversy upon this doctrine is to be relinquished. For this, two reasons are assigned: one, affecting the nature of the work, by which I had endeavoured to maintain the doctrine; and the other affecting the doctrine itself. The former, as it is stated by Mr. Belsham, the present champion of Socinianism, and repeated by his admirers, is, that it must be unnecessary at this time of day to prove, that the cause of Cain's rejection was not his having "offered a vegetable instead of an animal;" (which is, of course, the whole that this discerning writer could discover, as bearing upon the question of Atonement, in the volumes of this work that have been hitherto published;) and the latter is, that the fact of the mere humanity of Christ being (as it is modestly assumed) completely established, the received doctrine of the Atonement is thereby at once virtually overturned. Thus, we see, the doc-

trine of the Atonement, and the arguments which have been urged in its defence, are fairly run away from; and the various objections which had been so laboriously marshalled against that doctrine, by the ingenuity of former Socinians, are totally abandoned to their fate. The opponent of the doctrine of the Atonement having found it convenient thus to retire from the advanced position, and to direct his attacks against the doctrine from a more distant quarter, taking his stand upon the ground of the mere humanity of our Lord; thither, of course, the defender of the doctrine is obliged to follow, and finds himself compelled to carry on the combat on the new ground which the adversary has selected.

The contrivance, it has been seen, by which the modern Socinian deems it most expedient to maintain his extravagant notions concerning our Lord's humanity, is the propagation of a false Gospel. To the exposure of this false Gospel the attention of the Author of these volumes has been consequently directed. And although the endeavour to accomplish this object has led to a considerable extension of the work, yet he trusts, that, in the nature of the case and the great importance of the subject, the candid and Christian reader will discover his apology. Perhaps, indeed, when well considered, it is not so much for the extent to which he has pushed his exposure of the modern Socinians and their Version, that he needs excuse, as for his not having carried it much farther. He is happy, however, to have it in his power to say, that, in addition to what has been advanced in these sheets, enough (to honest and informed readers, perhaps, more than enough) has been done by the several distinguished writers whom he has occasionally named throughout the preceding Supplement, to put down the recent attempts which have been made by the modern Socinians in support of their system, through the medium of a falsified New Testament. To those several writers, especially to Bishop Burgess, Bishop Middleton, Dr. Nares, Dr. Laurence, Mr. Veysie, and Dr. Wardlaw, he refers the reader for the filling up what these pages have necessarily left untouched. To these writers there ought indeed to be added the name of Mr. Nolan, who, although he has not treated directly of the subject at issue with the Socinians, has thrown a most valuable light on what they have artfully contrived to draw into connexion with their object, by bringing Griesbach (whom they claim, though untruly, as a powerful auxiliary to their cause) under strict examination, and subjecting his system of classification to a critical and searching scrutiny. The work upon the *Integrity of the Vulgate Greek Text of the New Testament*, a work marked by characters of great industry, learning, and sagacity, be the ultimate decision upon the momentous and difficult subject of which it treats what it may, has, besides the merit of yielding strong support to certain important texts of the New Testament, the additional merit of giving a salutary check to the too unqualified (I had almost said the vulgar) admiration of an eminent critic, which the wily Socinians of the day have not failed to turn to mischievous account. An accurate appreciation of the due value of that critic's labours must be of the last advantage to Biblical literature: such appreciation has not yet been obtained, and to its attainment Mr. Nolan's work cannot but materially conduce.

Lodovicus Caracci pinxit. Raphael Morghen sculp.

MADONA COL BAMBINO

Il quadro Originale di egual grandezza trovasi nel Gabinetto del Sig.r Conte C. M. Gini à Bologna.

In Mannheim presso D. Artaria 1804.

A

SERMON

PREACHED BEFORE

THE ASSOCIATION

FOR

DISCOUNTENANCING VICE AND PROMOTING THE PRACTICE OF RELIGION AND VIRTUE,

IN

ST. ANNE'S CHURCH, DUBLIN,

ON THURSDAY, THE 5TH OF MAY, 1796.

A

SERMON.

JOSHUA—Chap. xxiv., part of the 15th Verse.

"AND IF IT SHALL SEEM EVIL UNTO YOU TO SERVE THE LORD, CHOOSE YE THIS DAY WHOM YE WILL SERVE—BUT AS FOR ME AND MY HOUSE, WE WILL SERVE THE LORD."

If it seem evil to serve the Lord!—to *serve* that great Being, before whom angels bow, and in whose presence the highest orders of seraphic dignities stand dismayed!—*evil* to serve the Lord!—evil to serve him, whose goodness shines through all the wonders of creation; and whose power, unbounded as it is, but ministers to the happiness of all his creatures! And can it to any created being seem evil to serve this all-mighty and all-bounteous Master? Yes, my brethren: strange and unnatural! some there are, to whom such service seems an evil—some there are, who disdain to bend before the majesty of their Creator; who scorn to accept the riches of his bounty; and to whom it appears a lighter servitude to drag the chains of sin than to bear the yoke of their salvation. That such there are, that such, alas! abound at this day, and in this nation, the occasion of our present assembling sufficiently announces—the existence and objects of the Association I am now called on to address but too manifestly evince it—for, wherefore have you linked together into a firm phalanx in behalf of virtue, but to repel the audacious and

overbearing assaults of vice? For what purpose leagued, a sacred band, in defence of religion, but because the giant strides of infidelity have threatened it with instant ruin? You have associated in support of virtue, in support of your religion, and your God—because the enemies of virtue, of religion, and of God, abound. Glorious Association! But in the same degree in which *it* is glorious is the cause of it disgraceful and deplorable—disgraceful, that in a Christian land you have been compelled to *embody* in defence of Christianity—and deplorable, that you have been arrayed to combat, not only the secret assailant of the Christian faith, but the open blasphemer of the divine administration. With these foes to the morals and the happiness of man you have now brought the matter to a fair issue—you have called aloud upon the people of this land, in the words of Joshua—"If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose ye this day whom ye *will* serve;" and you have, all and each of you, been pledged by this grand and awful declaration—"but as for me and my house, *we* will serve the Lord."——May God grant, that the solemn appeal, which you have thus made, may warn the irreligious from the ruin of his ways; and that the declaration, by which you have thus bound yourselves to the service of your God, may fix you immoveably in the paths of righteousness—"that your light may so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven!"

To animate your efforts in the great cause you have undertaken shall be the object of the present discourse—and to this end, what can more powerfully conduce, than a fair display of the *excellence* of that, for which you contend—of the *necessity*, which the present time furnishes for your exertions—and of the *means* most likely to crown those exertions with success? To these three points, then, I solicit your most serious attention.

Excellent indeed, my brethren, is that for which you contend. The blessings of religion, which you labour to secure and diffuse, are placed far above all worldly valuation. The

sentiment which connects man with an all-powerful Superior —which inspires him with the reverence of a secret power, that can explore the deep retreats of thought—and fills his breast with anxious and humble longings for the approbation of a Being, whose purity will accept no service but that of virtue—can supply the only solid foundation of private rectitude and of public prosperity.

That man, whether in his individual or collective state, can rest on this principle alone, as the source of his truest comforts and highest perfection—is a truth, which the native feelings of ages the most simple, and the cultured reason, and instructed experience, of nations the most refined, have been found, at all times, most forcibly to inculcate. It has been reserved for an age, vainly professing to enjoy higher degrees of illumination than any that has preceded, to question its validity, and in a great measure to disclaim its influence. The connexion, then, of the religious sentiment with the well-being of individuals, and of communities, it has unhappily become not unnecessary to discuss—nor let such discussion be deemed, on the present occasion, unseasonable. True it is, that your full persuasion on this very head has induced you, my brethren, to range yourselves thus openly around the standard of religion—and, from the cultivated understandings of my hearers, there is little reason to suppose them unacquainted with any of those arguments that urge to its defence ; yet so great is the importance of this truth, so beneficial must be the effects upon your zeal, from a strong and lively conviction of it, that no enforcement can be unprofitable, no repetition superfluous.—But, admitting that your knowledge requires no instructor—that your ardour demands no stimulus—yet surely the minister of God's word must deem no time unfit to proclaim this momentous truth, THAT WITHOUT RELIGION THERE IS NO VIRTUE—WITHOUT VIRTUE, NO HAPPINESS.

To be happy, a man must be satisfied with himself—he must view the past with complacency, and the present with contentment. The different parts of his nature must not be

discordant. He must, in short, be *one* uniform and consistent being—acting under the influence of one steady principle, that, by controlling the affections, and directing them to their proper objects, shall secure to the state of the individual an undisturbed tranquillity. Now, whence can be derived this governing principle, that gives the mind a power over itself? The power that resists self must be traced to something beyond self. Like the philosopher, who boasted, that the might of his mechanism could move even this globe which we inhabit, we require an *external* fulcrum—that great prop, on which the mind can rest, until it has acquired an energy superior even to itself, can only be religion. Without this, what shall prevent the anarchy of conflicting passions, or the despotic tyranny of one overbearing and predominant appetite? For wherefore sacrifice any pleasure of this world, if for this world alone we live? To what purpose exercise any severities of self-denial, if there is no superintending Being, to whom the sacrifices of virtue are acceptable—nor any state of succeeding felicity, for which they are to prepare?

Shall we say, that the happiness of the present life is best promoted by controlling the irregularities of appetite, and restraining the excesses of selfishness—and that therefore reason itself, enforcing the dictates of an enlightened self-interest, furnishes to virtue a sufficient support? This, indeed, is a principle, that may perhaps operate on the philosophic mind; which, used to contemplate actions in their consequences, can discern distant good, without the diminution of perspective; and whose very habits have reduced the violence of the fiercer passions; but to the unlettered multitude, or their unreflecting superiors, its effect must be of little value. Aided by all the power that religion can superadd, have we not to lament the insufficiency of its influence? Remove then this great auxiliary—how feeble, how nugatory its operation! But what, if the corruptions of the human heart shall be seen to prove this boasted principle of modern refinement not only inefficient, but untrue—and if we shall find this pillar of philosophic tranquillity subverted by the

very conditions of human existence? "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," is the language of him who knows of no life beyond the present—the passing moment he feels may be the sum of his existence—the pleasure he postpones may be lost to him for ever—and surely he will not calculate so inconsistently, as to balance the bare possibility of future enjoyment against the certainty of the present. No—*every* pleasure that offers itself, will be seized with avidity—each new instance of mortality will but furnish a stronger impulse to *immediate* gratification—and thus the very warnings, which should reclaim from vice, will become the most powerful incentives to the unbounded indulgence of every criminal affection.

But, shall we not find in public opinion a controlling power—and will not shame restrain where reason has proved insufficient? In answer to this let it be observed, that even granting, that public opinion could reach beyond *public* offences—and that its operation affected, not merely the *act* but the *motive*, there yet remain certain classes, on which it can have little effect. The two extremes of society, are equally insensible to its influence—the one shrouded in its obscurity, the other shielded by its splendour, are alike secure from the intimidation of public censure—and amongst the intermediate ranks, where reputation is admitted to exert its fullest force, shall we not find the rule itself fashioned by the manners, and consequently transmitting the corruptions of the higher ranks? Or, *should* opinion for some time hold out against the influence of high example, what will avail its feeble voice against the clamorous importunity of passion? The hope of secrecy will first encourage—next, example will be sought to justify—and, lastly, a bold and hardened defiance will be held out to all its terrors and restraints. Thus we find this boasted succour itself requires support.

Let us then advance one step farther—let the force of law be superadded—the operation of *this*, extending to every rank, and its enforcements to every mind; it is urged, that this will supply what the former principle wanted as to uni-

versality, or as to coercion. And are we then at last obliged to fly to an *external* control?—and do we acknowledge, that the only sure support of virtue is to be sought in the fear of a superior power—whilst we deny the beneficial operation of the same motive where its effects are infinitely more important? Yes, we would place the sceptre in the hand of man, that we may wrest it from the hand of God The penalties of human law we readily admit to be indispensable—but those of the divine law we labour to exclude from our minds, by the intervention of every plea that a perverted ingenuity can suggest—we discover that fear is a slavish principle of action; and that obedience from such motive must be without merit: nay more, we find out that there is nothing to be feared—either the soul is to be consigned to perpetual sleep —or, if reason and nature extort the admission of a future state, we repose on the assurance, that the goodness of the Deity cannot permit that any of his creatures should be unhappy. Thus are we determined, at all events, to assert our independence of the Almighty—and thus we satisfy ourselves, that the fear of God is useless as an auxiliary to virtue; whilst we find it unavoidable to call in the aid of human power to its support.

But let us examine a little the strength of this all-sufficient stay—will the force of law subdue the workings of the *mind?* Will it reach those passions that lurk in the retirement of the heart? or will it repress those vices that confine their noxious influence to the individual? No—suited to the power that framed them, they can be directed only against such vices as stand forward in actual commission—and suited to the end at which they aim, they can restrain only such passions as war against the public peace—thus the heart remains unaffected; and the passions, unimpaired in their force, though limited in their range, are only turned into other channels, in which they may flow with unimpeded current.

Thus interest, reputation, laws, are all found insufficient to the maintenance of virtue—some vices they may enable

us to restrain, and others they may teach us to conceal—but that great governing power of the mind, that proclaims hostility against all, and that exercises over the passions a strict and sovereign dominion, must be traced to some higher source. Religion alone it is that can secure to man this authoritative principle—without *its* saving influence, miserable indeed had been his state—borne headlong by impetuous appetite, and distracted by contending passions, how dreadful the anarchy of the individual, how dismal the chaos of the heart, had not the Spirit of God moved upon its troubled surface, and hushed to rest its jarring elements! Yes, religion alone it is that can bind these discordant parts into one consistent system; and, by reducing all under the control of one steady and powerful force, maintain the stability and uniformity of virtue—and surely, if such be the power of the religious sentiment in general, it eminently belongs to that pure and perfect religion which we enjoy—a religion, which, by teaching the sublimest notions of the Deity—by inculcating the great heinousness of sin—and by establishing, *beyond doubt*, a future state of retribution, gives to virtue a strength that is irresistible—and which, unlike the fallacious principles that worldly wisdom would set up in its stead, extends its influence through all ranks and conditions of human nature; addressing itself to the peasant with no less force than to the philosopher; and directing its terrors, with equal justice, against the corruptions of the court and of the cottage —whilst the jurisdiction of its all-searching tribunal is not confined to the outward act; but, penetrating the inmost recesses of the mind, explores and regulates the most secret movements of thought, and establishes external decorum on the solid basis of internal rectitude.

But whilst many are ready to admit, that virtue is necessary to *individual* happiness—and that for virtue the only sure foundation is religion—they seem to consider man, in his *collective* state, by no means equally dependent on the same support—as if the happiness of society were something different from that of the individuals that compose it—or, as if

man underwent a total change of constitution by associating with his fellow men—a position, involving consequences so irreconcileable with reason, I should not think it necessary to refute, did not both the theories, and the practice of modern politicians, evince the extensive range of its influence—did we not find, that in the computation of the strength of a people, the virtue of the individuals no longer forms any part of the estimate—and that in calculating the means, by which national prosperity may be advanced, religion is uniformly left out of the account. The wealth, the valour, the public spirit, and due subordination of its subjects are deemed the bulwark of the state—and in the vigorous administration of salutary laws the welfare of the community is thought to be permanently secured. Beyond these the politician looks not —vain, short-sighted man! he looks not to that great, creative, and sustaining power, which alone can produce these, and without which they cannot possibly continue—for whence, but from frugal industry, from manly temperance, from diffused benevolence, from submissive resignation, and from disinterested patriotism, have these national safeguards been derived? and surely from no other principle than that which is confessed to be the source of *individual* virtue, can *these* virtues originate;—again, remove that principle, and you will see the very wealth of the state subverting it by luxury—you will see its valour dissolve into effeminacy—you will see its public spirit degenerate into an ambitious conflict for power—its subordination unhinged by licentiousness—and its laws perverted and depraved, as well by the rapacity of those who are to govern, as by the turbulence of those who should obey.

The WEALTH of the state—must it not be supported by extensive commerce and multiplied manufactures? and are not these, without the corrective of religion, the unfailing corruptors of national morals? Will not the same gales, that waft to our shores the produce of distant countries, carry to us their luxuries and their vices? and will not the collected numbers, that are promiscuously crowded together for the

purposes of manufacture, engender a contagion, not less fatal to the morals than that which their unwholesome haunts daily send forth is found to be to the health of the lower classes of the community?

But it is not from the *sources* of national wealth alone that its corruptions are to be feared; affluence in the higher ranks will beget extravagance—extravagance will be followed by want—and in the struggle to support former state, and to indulge in habitual vanities, all means, however base, will be resorted to,—until, at length, a total profligacy succeed, and sweep away in its impetuous current every remnant of principle and virtue. Nor will the mischief rest here—the example will descend—until the general taste for pleasure and dissipation, having ranged with wasteful step through the intermediate classes, shall at length strip even the artizan of his industry; and, robbing his family of their natural support, leave his helpless offspring, if not to perish, to grow up in idleness, ignorance, and vice, for the disturbance, perhaps for the destruction, of society. Amidst this general dissoluteness of manners, all generous ardour and manly spirit must melt away—pleasure will effeminate, and intemperance consume, the energies of the nation—until the enfeebled victim shall at length sink under its own corruptions, or fall an unresisting prey to the attacks of the first warlike invader.

But *should* even the valour of the people rise superior to these enervating causes, are we to look to *this* as the bulwark of national prosperity? Surely war will not be ranked amongst the means of national welfare—nor can increased dominion (the only acquisition of military achievements) be considered an additional security. If men are corrupt, by widening the sphere of empire, we only multiply the means of mutual corruption—and, in the extension of conquest, we lay a sure foundation for the perpetuity of the calamities of war. Besides, what shall protect the state itself against the instrument of its victories? May not the great engine of national carnage be turned against its employer? And has not experience abundantly evinced, that in periods of general licentiousness,

and popular depravity, no reliance is to be placed on the fidelity of armies?

Again—shall we find in PUBLIC SPIRIT a sufficient safeguard? That there exists, between the public good and the welfare of the individual, an indissoluble connexion, cannot be denied—but were this connexion even obviously discernible, the abstract contemplation of it would but ill serve, as a rule, or as a motive. Will the unlearned *see*, or the unprincipled *feel* the public interest, so as to be regulated by its dictates? The individual will, in many cases, be unable to trace the pressure, which bears upon *him*, to the general principle, whose operation overbalances partial inconvenience by public benefit—or if he should in every case connect it with its true cause, of what avail is this without religion? Why should he, who acknowledges no god but self, contribute to the general good, at the expense of personal enjoyment? What is public spirit without private virtue? What *can* it be? Surely, nothing but vanity or ambition. Wound that vanity, or disappoint that ambition; and you will see the *patriot* of to-day, become the *incendiary* of to-morrow—the public good, lost in the contemplation of his own fancied wrongs—and the torch of discord, and rebellion, lighted up from the flames of his private resentment. Every day's experience convinces us all of this—nor, indeed, can it be otherwise—for what is patriotism, but the principle of rectitude moving in a larger sphere? What, but the wider diffusion of the charities of private life? Without virtue, there is no rectitude—without religion, there are no charities—the selfish principle alone can guide him, who is destitute of virtue—and a patriot without religion can feel no interest in the welfare of his country, farther than as it is connected with his own personal advantage.

Again—though wealth, valour, and public spirit, are found insufficient, will not the power of government supply every deficiency—and binding together the great fabric of civil society, secure it from dissolution? Equally insufficient will this be found, if the morals of the people be corrupted—the

internal principle of dissolution is at work, and no human contrivance can stop the progress of its ruinous operation—for first, how shall government itself subsist? It will not be said, by force. Despotic power, at all times unsafe, is, in the present state of things, impossible—men know too well their collective powers, to be compelled to slavery in the mass;—but could even despotism maintain its usurpations, surely a system that subjects by debasing, and tranquillizes by crushing, every human energy, will not be contended for, on the ground of national prosperity.

Since, then, by force alone governments cannot subsist, what remains for their support, but the principle of subordination? This, indeed, is the true cement of civil union—but without religion, whence is this to arise? Since such is the condition of human affairs, that the greater part of mankind must be reduced to toil, for the necessary support of existence; whilst they see all the luxuries, and, as *they* think, the blessings of life, heaped profusely upon their superiors, without any effort for their acquisition; and can discern no difference between themselves and those favourites of fortune, save what arises from the accidental circumstance of birth—what is to teach the poor man acquiescence in his lot? What is there, to induce him, to pay a *willing* submission to those laws, that seem to place a barrier between him and happiness—and to contribute to the support of that system, which, whilst it secures to others all the pleasures of the world, has nothing in reserve for him, but hardship and misfortune? The philosophy of the peasant will not reach to the discovery, that this partial pressure is general good—nor will his patriotism find, in this reflexion, a sufficient consolation for the sufferings he endures. Let not the politician rashly say, that his *willingness* to submit is of little moment, since that submission may be compelled—let him reflect, that in the mass of the people there is a principle, which, though it may be for a while kept under, can never be totally subdued; it may be pent up by the force of compression, but it will at some

time undoubtedly break forth, with a violence proportioned to the restraint: let then this truth never be forgotten, that no government can be secure that is not exercised over a *willing* people.

But we shall be told, that the pure administration of equitable laws will ensure an unconstrained obedience. Little will avail all human laws, if not sustained by national morality: why should they, who are *at war* with virtue, submit to laws framed for its support? The laws themselves, if friendly to morals, will furnish *occasion* for discontent and resistance, and the very means, which in a virtuous community would have secured tranquillity, will, to a corrupt people, prove the source of discord and commotion. Thus we find that laws *presuppose* virtue, where they profess to befriend it, and that they must ultimately rest upon that very principle, the want of which it is pretended they can supply.

But, granting that the laws possess sufficient power to secure subordination, what shall guard us against the laws themselves? Since both to frame, and to execute them, can belong but to a few; if there be not virtue to restrain the love of power, to what are we to look for protection; from their corrupt enaction, or their oppressive administration? Nay more, conceding the utmost that can possibly be required—that on the part of the governors, laws will be wisely framed, and impartially administered; and, on the part of the people, willingly and readily obeyed—not to object that there are many and heinous offences that cannot possibly come within the circle of their jurisdiction, being beyond the power of man with strictness to define, or with certainty to discover, we shall yet find their boasted influence, even in that, which they claim as their peculiar province, the punishment of open crimes, entirely nugatory, if not sustained by the religious principle—for is it not on *testimony* that the efficacy of laws must *ultimately* depend? Remove then the religion of an oath, and what protection is there for the good, what punishment for the wicked? Will the Atheist respect an appeal to

that Being, whose existence he denies? Or will he, who lives only to *himself*, scruple to sacrifice the property, or even the life of another, to that which he deems his final good?

But, in fact, for a society of *Atheists* to exist is impossible. Without a God there is no conscience; without conscience, the only duty is self-gratification; social virtue of every kind vanishes—nothing remains on which mutual reliance can be built, all must be done in compliance with external power, and every law will be disregarded, when it may be done with secrecy or impunity—and present pleasure or profit tempts to the violation. Let the Atheist produce a single instance of any one nation, in any period, subsisting without religion, and then it may be admitted that religion is not necessary to the existence of a state; if he finds the annals of history unstained by such an instance, let him then account for so extraordinary a phenomenon in the moral world as this—that from the creation to the present moment, every society of men has been under a gross delusion, in a matter affecting their most important interests, and we shall be content to let the glory of his superior wisdom, rise triumphant on the ruins of all ancient opinions. If he assign political contrivance as the cause of the universality of the religious principle, let him consider what he allows us—that the religious principle has been *deemed* by all politicians and legislators the only sure bond of civil union; and also, that it finds in the mind of man something so *congenial to its nature*, that it has been in the power of legislators and politicians to make it a matter of universal adoption;—thus then the two great points on which we build are given up—that religion is *necessary* to civil society, and that it has its *foundation* in the natural reason and sentiments of man;—and from this it follows, that the Atheist not only declares himself at war with reason and nature, but is, by his own confession, a determined foe to government, and to society.

Nor can he avoid the force of this inference, by the few instances that may possibly be found, of those who, rejecting all religion, have yet conducted themselves as good moral

characters; for it should be remembered, that such, though *now* they disclaim its influence, had, at an age susceptible of permanent impressions, received the tincture of religious principles; which, though themselves discarded, have left behind them habitudes favourable to virtue. Besides, whilst religion is professed by the community at large, and the moral duties consequently held in general estimation, the force of opinion, aided by the vanity and zeal which usually accompany the profession of a new system, will lead to the observance of the latter, where all regard for the former has been thrown off; so that, on the whole, the blameless morality of such persons furnish a proof, not of the inutility, but of the indirect influence, of religion. This, then, is *not* an example suited to the case—no—let an instance be produced of the *entire* body of a people, *destitute* of the religious principle, and regularly trained up in the *disbelief* of a God, and we shall have a fair ground for decision.

One unhappy experiment, indeed, *has* been made to exhibit this melancholy example: what has been its effect? We have seen a nation, discharged of every moral feeling, and abandoned to every species of impiety, labouring to throw off a sentiment, which could only serve to give pain from its continual violation: we have seen these efforts aided by all the force that the example and the power of its impious rulers could bestow; and we have seen them, whilst cursed with a momentary success, bring forth atrocities more horrid than the page of history can produce;—and again, have we not seen this wretched people, whose refuge was Atheism, and whose best hope was annihilation, overwhelmed by the force of nature, and yielding to the voice of reason? And do we not now behold those, who direct the affairs of that ill-fated country, labouring to build up that very system which their predecessors had gloried to overturn? Now let it be remarked—that whilst the object of those who swayed the public opinion was to subvert established order and excite to furious outrage—so long Atheism was made the boast of the legislature and the fashion of the multitude; but when

a *settled system* of civil regulation was to be adopted, religion was instantly called in—the belief of a God and his superintending Providence, solemnly announced—and the dark sleep of death made to retire before the dawn of an eternal existence. —Thus, then, even from those whose testimony in favour of religion cannot be questioned, on the ground of superstitious attachment to its interests, we have received this instructive lesson—that if we would disturb all order, and disband society, religion must be discarded—and that on the contrary, if government is to be established, and social happiness secured, to that saving principle alone must we look for effectual aid.

If, then, from the whole it be an obvious result—that religion is necessary to civil society—that, without it, neither the comforts, nor even the existence of the social state can be preserved—it needs little argument to shew, that the more *pure* that religion is, the more the happiness of the community, as well as of the individual, must be advanced; try this by experience—amongst the nations of antiquity, do we not uniformly find their prosperity keeping pace with their morality, and their morality commensurate with their religion? But I will not detain you with the particulars of an induction so obtrusive—every page of ancient history proclaims the fact—and if we find this to have been the case, even amidst the wild superstitions, and perverted morals of the heathen; what should we not expect, from the sublime doctrines, and refined morality of the gospel?—from a religion, which not only affords to *individual* virtue the most powerful support, but enforces with peculiar energy those qualities that sustain the *social* system?

In vain does the corrupt sophistry of the Deist object to this beneficent dispensation—that it has been the occasion of war, and persecution—that its precepts are inconsistent with civil liberty—and that those virtues, with which it professes to adorn the Christian character, it has been found ineffectual to secure. To charge upon Christianity the faults and crimes of those that have usurped its name, is the only

resource that remains to its enemies, when they can find nothing in the religion itself on which to fasten condemnation—but it requires uncommon hardihood, to impute the ferocities of war, and the cruelties of persecution, to a system, whose very essence is benevolence—whose distinguishing features are humanity, gentleness, long-suffering, kindness, brotherly love—and whose glory it is, to have extended, even to foes and oppressors, those kindly affections, which the utmost stretch of heathen morality could not carry beyond the friend and the benefactor. The objection, then, that would fix upon the benignant principles of Christ's holy religion, the vindictive malignities of some of its professors, involves a confusion too clumsy, to pass even on the most unthinking.

Of equal force is the argument, that would pronounce Christianity injurious to freedom. Patriotism, indeed, has not been formally announced, in the catalogue of Christian virtues—and the language of the gospel has declared peaceful submission to the powers that be, a Christian duty—but the same gospel has enforced a benevolence, embracing all the charities of social life; and has enjoined to governors, a mild and equitable exercise of power, as implied in the precept, and corresponding to the duty, of unresisting obedience. How, then, can that be called hostile to liberty, which mediates between the people and the ruler—which generates on the one hand, subordination and tranquillity; and on the other, justice and moderation—which resists no rational and peaceful means of securing the just rights of the subject—and which, whilst it strengthens the ties of allegiance, and increases the public stock of virtue, diminishes the jealousy of power—and guarding freedom against the abuses of licentiousness, renders those restraints unnecessary, which a *corrupt* people require for their control?

But again, it is urged, that the advantages of Christianity, with regard to individual virtue, have been much overrated—and that in the Christian world, vice and immorality are still found to prevail. Now I will only ask, whether where

this immorality is found to prevail, there does not prevail *irreligion* also—and whether the man, who indulges in habitual vice, has not, in the first instance, released his conscience from a sense of Christian obligation? What *denomination* he may wear, is of little moment. The man who violates the precepts of Christianity, is *not* a Christian—and to object *his* vices to the religion which he rejects, is a species of reasoning well suited to those who resist the cause of virtue and of truth. The *value* of the religion is to be judged of by its natural tendency, and by an actual effect upon those who are governed by its influence. That even in countries where Christianity is professed, there are many, to whom that influence has not extended, can furnish no argument against a system which works not by physical compulsion.

But let not the infidel triumph in the inefficacy of the gospel—let him consider, that the multitudes which it *silently* leads to piety and goodness, are unobtrusive, and unknown—and that many, even of those who disgrace the Christian name, may possibly have been kept back from greater enormities, by the restraints which Christianity may have wrought into their early habits, or which it may indirectly impose through the medium of society;—but that, after every possible allowance, the number of those who live in opposition to the Christian precepts, is great—that the influence of religion upon our hearts and lives, is at this day considerably reduced, must unhappily be confessed—but what do I infer?—that the friends of virtue and religion should exert themselves the more.

Yes, my brethren, the present times do *indeed* call for your exertions. The decline of Christianity—the decline of religion—the decline of morals—the threatened ruin of your country—all demand your most strenuous efforts. That Christianity, religion, and morals *have* declined, each day's observation furnishes proof in melancholy abundance—for whence the desertion of our churches—the disregard and violation of the sabbath—the neglect and ridicule of Christian duties—the eager reception of all works calculated to de-

preciate and traduce the Christian faith—the gross abuse of oaths—the perversion and defiance of public opinion—the universal rage of dissipation—the unbounded pursuit of pleasure—the contempt and hatred of all authority—the rapid decrease of modesty and chastity amongst our females—the extravagant profusion of all ranks—begetting in the highest, embarrassment, venality, meanness, profligacy; — in the middle orders,—bankruptcy, indigence, family distress;— and in the lowest class, idleness, debauchery, violence, disregard of law, impatience of control, insurrection, massacre?

I know, that at all times the moralist and the preacher have deplored and condemned the vices of their contemporaries, as exceeding those of former ages, whilst in many cases they only borrowed from the nearer view an artificial magnitude; but on inquiry, I fear it will be found that this picture, dismal as it is, merits not the charge of exaggeration—for look abroad and see what is the real state of things.

As to religion, look even to its *externals*. In what manner do we find the worship of that great Being who made heaven and earth conducted? Do we not see that day, peculiarly allotted to the glorifying of his name, consumed by the lower ranks, in gross intemperance, and blasphemy and riot—whilst among the higher, no longer able to excite even a weariness of its dull uniformity, have we not seen a liberalizing fashion strip it of its sanctity, and extend to it all the customary modes of pleasurable indulgence? Not content with exploding the old-fashioned notion, that the public worship of the most High should be attended with regularity, and engaged in with reverence, do we not see it sending forth a more than usual display of vanity, and unfolding a more laborious magnificence; as if to ridicule the humble votary of the temple, and to disgrace the festival of God's hallowed rest? And with those who would be ranked amongst the more refined, do we not see the evening of this sacred day conclude with all the usual round of dissipation—to the scandal of religion, to the prejudice of those whom their example may

corrupt, and to the actual hindrance of every member of their household from the discharge of any of the pious duties of the day? Nay more—lest the abuses of God's sabbath should not be sufficiently pernicious, if confined within the privacy of their dwellings, have we not seen a public entertainment set apart for its peculiar use?—thus openly proclaiming hostilities against the sabbath, and calling in the multitude to share in the profanation of the triumph. On this last act of profligacy I am unwilling to dwell—it is difficult to speak of such abominations with the moderation suited to this place. I shall therefore only beg to remind those, on whom this establishment may depend for patronage and support—that if there be any *one* species of impiety, by which the very *notion* of religion may be clean wiped from the minds of an entire people, it is that of an *habitual violation and contempt of the sabbath*—and if there be any *one* scheme, by which this may be completely effected, it is by an institution, which appoints a public entertainment for the regular returns of the sabbath—which stamps that entertainment with the sanction of distinguished names — and which spreads round it all the attractive splendour of affluence and fashion—whilst the pretended harmlessness of the objects of the meeting are made to cheat timidity of its scruples, and the plea of charity held out as a compromise to conscience,—a plea ill becoming those who overlook a fund, which *obviously* presents itself, and which connects the cause of humanity with the worship and glory of the Creator. ——And are we to wonder, if after such examples we should find that, amongst the lower classes of our people, this day, which was given for rest, is turned to riot—that each return of it is celebrated as a bacchanalian festival—and that the interval which it affords from worldly occupations, for the purpose of impressing the seriousness of religious feeling, is employed for the sole end of violating every religious precept, and promoting every species of disorder and immorality?

When the worship, and consequently the reverence, of the Supreme Being has been thus generally laid aside, we might

naturally expect to find, amongst the many melancholy effects that follow, that even the last solemn appeal to divine omniscience should cease to be respected, and that the obligation of an oath should in a great measure have lost its force—and is not this the case? Do we not see it day after day bartered by the necessities of one class, and bent to the convenience of another? Administered without ceremony, and taken without consideration, do we not find it frequently employed as an idle pageant to qualify for office, or as a destructive weapon suited to the basest purposes of rapacity or malice? Look to those struggles of ambition, which each returning period of delegation brings upon a land more tenacious of liberty than virtue—what are they but great convulsions of the moral system—by which every principle of truth is torn up by the roots—whilst the treasures of the rich are everywhere employed to create and purchase the perjuries of the poor? Nay, look even to those courts, in which the venerable form of justice is seen to preside—how is the solemnity of an oath trifled with and abused? Even in that place, where this awful appeal to the Eternal Judge is made the security of life, reputation, liberty—of all that is dear to man—with what disgraceful levity do we too often find it treated? What ingenuity do we see employed to colour the falsehoods of subornation, and to confound the honest simplicity of truth into inconsistency? And are we then, after all this, to wonder if the very *notion* of truth be not amongst the conceptions of our poor? Are we to wonder, if we find the promise of the tradesman but the pledge of our disappointment; and the confidence reposed in the domestic repaid with the pillage of his master? Are we to wonder, if we find fidelity in private life, and allegiance in public, scoffed at as empty names—and if the *only* covenant to which the lower classes of our people are found not unfaithful, is a COVENANT OF BLOOD?—a covenant, which binds them to carry terror and desolation through the land, and with embodied outrage to menace even the venerable fabric of our constitution.

Here opens one of the dreadful consequences of that irreligion which has long been creeping unperceived, but now lifts its head and stalks abroad in ghastly triumph. When the great one of this world ridiculed in theory, and by his practice insulted the sanctimonious duties of religion, he was not aware that the contagion of his example would rapidly descend. He was not aware that the restraints of religion must appear sufficiently burdensome to those on whom they imposed a patient submission to the hardships of poverty, and that little encouragement was wanting to induce them to throw them off. He was not aware, that in shaking the authority of religion, he was undermining the very foundation on which *he* stood. Let him now look round and survey the fruits of his achievements. He thought, perhaps, if he thought at all, that the operation of moral causes was slow, and with the philanthropy suited to his principles, consoled himself with the reflection, that things would last *his* time[a], and that he need not fear to contribute by his vicious indulgences to the swelling of a storm, which was to burst on the head of *posterity*—but let him now ponder the awful lesson of irreligious example striking instantaneous root, and suddenly shooting up in savage outrage and national convulsion—let him behold an infuriate populace arming for the destruction of their country—and whilst the grand scheme of political subversion has been maturing by secret and systematic combination, and awaiting its completion by the infusion of a foreign force, let him behold the genius of insurrection, mean time, impatient of delay, breaking forth in acts of violence and carnage—the laws resisted and defied—and the strength of government challenged to open conflict—let him also behold the new monster assassination, coolly dealing out its havoc, and aiming its poniard, one time against the active vindicator of his own and his country's rights, and at another,

[a] "After *us* the Deluge"—had been a phrase of familiar consolation amongst those whose vices concurred with the principles of a destructive philosophy, to draw down ruin upon a neighbouring country. On the awful anticipation of this *reversion*, it may not be unwise to reflect.

against the suspected partner of the dangerous secret—and let him, whilst he is made to tremble for his very existence, and whilst he is compelled to convert his house into a fortress, and to exchange the comforts of domestic tranquillity for the terrors of intestine commotion—let him, I say, reflect upon the just judgments of that Providence which has thus visited him with the consequences of *his* impiety—let him reflect, that *he* it was who had provided the instruments for sedition—that, in preparing the minds of the people, for the willing and ready admission of those doctrines of treason and rebellion, that have been lately circulated, with a success to be equalled only by the zeal of their propagation—*he* it was who had pointed the dagger that the unnatural assassin of his country has aimed at her existence. The deadly blow has been, indeed, averted by the wise and vigilant exertions of our governors; but let him not thence conclude all danger past. The wisdom and the strength of man will avail nothing against the councils of the Almighty; and the scourge of our iniquities, though for a time withheld in mercy, will, if that mercy be slighted, return with tenfold vengeance.

Let me then implore *even* those who can estimate religion only by its temporal effects, to awake *at length* to the consequences of its dereliction, and to unite with the friends of virtue in stemming the torrent of public immorality—if they can *yet* remain so blind, as not to see that the destruction of social order is the natural product of national irreligion, let me entreat them to turn their eyes to the professed opponents of government and subordination, and observe in what manner they execute their schemes of *subversion*—whether it be not their plan to sow the seed of insurrection by scattering the principles of infidelity—and whether they do not make regular preparation for overturning allegiance to the *magistrate*, by stripping men of allegiance to *their God?*

For what has been the fact? Have we not seen for some time past a *regular systematic* diffusion of Atheism through the land—societies deliberately formed for the purpose—their united talents and treasures *charitably* employed to reduce

the abstruseness and the bulk of ancient blasphemies within the apprehension and the purchase of the multitude—and thus, a system of diabolical *retail* (as it were) established by which even a pennyworth of Atheism is ready prepared for the poor—the very infant furnished with his primer of infidelity—and the mendicant enabled to pick up the poisoned morsel on the highway[a]. And by whom has been conducted, this process of *modern illumination?* Is it not by the very persons who have been labouring to disturb the public peace, and to overturn the constitution? They knew too well that religion is the only basis of social order—they had seen the *same* methods successful in a late unhappy instance—and they naturally looked for the same consequences. That the same consequences have *not* followed, demands our fervent gratitude to the gracious Disposer of events; who, by bringing to light their wicked counsels, and prospering the salutary endeavours of our political protectors, has reserved us yet for further trial—and enabled us, if we will, to return to his righteousness and be saved.

But although these enemies of human happiness have failed in accomplishing the *whole* of their destructive purpose, it is dreadful to think how far they have been able to advance. To be released at once from the fear of God and man, to open wide the door to the indulgence of the worst and most violent passions of our nature, to unrein licentiousness, and to hold out to the meanest, the sudden acquisition of unbounded wealth and power, carry with them charms not to be resisted; and treason and impiety have accordingly been found to spread around their baneful influence. Here, then, my brethren, is a *field indeed* for your exertions —when irreligion, hitherto confined to the palaces of volup-

[a] It is a fact, unhappily too notorious in this country to need any additional testimony, that short and popular Atheistical tracts have for some time back been circulated through every part of the kingdom, but especially the north, with a degree of system and zeal which have scarcely ever been exceeded; and that they have not only been sent abroad at prices so reduced as to make them accessible to all, but have been distributed amongst the peasants, and *literally scattered along the highways*, by persons specially employed to travel through the country for this very purpose.

tuous opulence, or the closets of lettered scepticism, has found its way even into the cottage of the peasant—it is full time, I say for *you*, who know the comfort of God's holy word, and the ruin that must arise from its rejection, to put forth your best and most strenuous efforts—and when this spirit of irreligion has carried in its train the spirit of insurrection, and all its fiend-like attendants; it is full time for *all* who regard the blessings of society, and the existence of our political establishment, to unite with you in rooting up this parent stock of every evil that can afflict the human race.

When the impieties that are usually nurtured on the rich heights of affluence are found to have spread even through the lowest ranks, the depravation of society must, indeed, be alarming—and yet I know not whether another more deadly symptom does not remain to be noticed—I know not whether the increasing dissipation and unprincipled pursuit of pleasure amongst the FEMALE part of the community, and which, no longer confined to the highest class, have reached deep into the middle rank, do not furnish a proof yet more deplorably convincing of the degraded state of religion and manners in the land; but if any delicacy remains to the public mind, let me not wound it by a review of the enormities, which this subject necessarily suggests. Here then let me draw the veil; but thus much it is unavoidable to remark —that if ever the women of any country shall become so far vicious, as to have thrown off all restraints of religion and decorum, and shall be able to turn the scale of fashion in their favour, so as to glory in their shame, and triumph in their dishonour—the fate of that country is decided—the descent to vice is no longer gradual—the fences of virtue are everywhere borne down by a sweeping and resistless torrent—and the land is deluged with abominations. The recent example of a neighbouring country has evinced the necessity of these consequences; it behoves us seriously to consider how far we of this nation, deserve to be secured from a similar catastrophe.

Alas! my brethren, it is alarming to reflect upon those vicious practices that disgrace *every* rank and description of the community; it is alarming to reflect upon that dissoluteness and dissipation which have nearly extinguished every moral and religious feeling; and in which we fearlessly indulge whilst we hang over the verge of a frightful precipice, which foreign and domestic enemies have prepared for our destruction. Dreadful infatuation! When the judgments of the Lord are abroad upon the earth; when the visitations of an insulted God are seen levelling the lofty mockers of his might; when the finger of desolation is beheld tracing in characters of vengeance the doom of nations—shall we disport ourselves in the revels of guilty pleasure, and slumber securely on the couch of sin, whilst the crash of Almighty vengeance thunders all around? If such be our insensibility, then are you, who have stationed yourselves as the sentinels of religion, called on to exert a tenfold vigilance, to sound in our ears the ruin that awaits us, to rouse us from the deadly trance, and to gird us with the armour of salvation.

Upon the whole, my fellow Christians, if *ever* there was a time when your exertions, and the exertions of all good men were indispensable, it is the present;—in an age, which, infected with the vanities of reason, and intoxicated with the pride of philosophy, affects to deride the great truths of Christ's holy religion, and mock at the sublime mysteries of our redemption;—at a day when a spirit of wild licentiousness, claiming the name of *liberality*, sweeps away all distinctions, and mixes all extremes; when religious sentiment is stigmatized as prejudice, and the simplicity of God's sacred word is branded with the name of folly; when the refinements of what is called *civilization* have *frittered* away the boundaries of right and wrong; and the speculative corruptions of the understanding, communicating their depravity to the heart, have spread their pollutions through every channel of the community; when we see the sanctions of the highest names confirming examples of irreligion, and creating a fashion that rapidly circulates their vices through every class, and

shoots the poison of their crimes through every member of the public body, until at last the fatal lesson has returned upon themselves; and those whom they had taught to disrespect their God, have learned to despise their *governors;* when the support of the laws has become a mark for popular revenge; when assassination has been reduced to *system;* when the furious spirit of innovation has gone abroad, and treason has not feared to rear its head in our very streets; when interest, and ambition, and voluptuousness, have everywhere set up their idols; and the *only* temple, in which the boasted wisdom of the present day refuses to bend the knee, is THE TEMPLE OF THE LIVING GOD;—when these things are so, surely we are called on, as if a voice from heaven had warned us, to arm ourselves against these abominations; these are evidently the provocations and preparatives to those last heavy judgments, which the wrath of God visits upon abandoned and reprobate nations; and these are the very characters whereby those countries, that have been swept with the besom of desolation, have been ruinously distinguished in the period immediately preceding their extinction.

Having thus shewn that there exists a *necessity* for the exertions of all who regard private happiness, or public prosperity, it remains to be considered what are the MEANS most likely to render those exertions successful, and what means could have been devised more efficacious than those which you, my brethren, have adopted? To strip vice of the sanctions of fashion, to tear off the mask of infidelity, to inculcate the principles of religion by your instructions, and to exhibit the loveliness of virtue in your practice;—for these purposes you have united, and to effect these great objects you have multiplied your individual strength, by the energies of associated zeal. You are not indeed armed with the power of the magistrate, nor do you carry with you the warrant of ecclesiastical commission;—but secured at the same time against those jealous fears of encroachment, that oppose the one—and the suspicion of self-interest, which injures the utility of the other—you possess, in your numbers and your

cause, every enforcement of authority, and every title to respect. In the prosecution of your plans you have been favoured with the co-operation of our GOVERNORS: because they well knew that the best interests of government must be co-extended with the diffusion of religion:—the earnest concurrence of the CLERGY you could not but have received; your cause and theirs are the same;—you have the hearts of all *good* men with you; you have the judgments of all *wise* men in your favour; even *intelligent selfishness* must be interested for the prosperity of your institution: with these advantages, with an advantage that far exceeds all, the approbation of that great Being, in whose cause you are enrolled, you have every assurance of success;—in the magnitude of the abuses which you have combined to combat, you have every demand for your exertion.

The *specific* measures of reform, which your collective wisdom has suggested, it is not my purpose to detail; time will not permit the enumeration; and the full and able discussion they have already received from my predecessors in this station must render it unnecessary; I shall therefore detain your attention only by such particulars as may deserve peculiar notice.

IGNORANCE, your Association has rightly judged the most fertile source of all moral and political disorder. With regret they saw, at the first moment of their formation, that, amongst the lower orders of our countrymen, it had taken deep and extensive root—they had seen it in their personal intercourse, they discovered it with still more formidable certainty, in the destructiveness of its effects. Against this great national evil, therefore, were directed their earliest efforts; and to promote the religious education of the children of the poor, became one of the *first* objects to which their energies were applied.

What were the salutary expedients, and judicious modes of encouragement adopted, to carry this purpose into effect, has been on a former occasion publicly stated—it is only necessary for me to add, that the effect has hitherto been fully

answerable to the most sanguine expectations, and that, so far as the operation of these means has hitherto been extended, their efficacy has been abundantly evinced by the emulation that has been excited, the desire of knowledge that has been diffused, and the actual attainments that have been made. One point, however, there is, connected with the subject, to which my duty requires me to advert. Some there are to whom the instruction of the lower orders appears in a light far from beneficial, and who consider the partial cultivation, to which, from the nature of their situation, they must necessarily be confined, as tending to render them dissatisfied with their condition, and exposing them to the insidious suggestions of the infidel and the seditious, by enabling them to peruse those writings which are daily circulated for their delusion, and which, being artfully adjusted to the standard of their ignorance and their passions, easily find amongst them eager and tumultuous advocates—whilst, on the other hand, the dictates of true wisdom, and practical prudence, necessarily addressing themselves to just principles of reasoning, and an unbiassed feeling of right, are in vain offered in confutation. In answer to this, I will not urge that the very argument which is here advanced against the intellectual improvements of the poor, derives its sole support from the abuses that grow out of a deficiency of knowledge; —I will not urge that ignorance is an unsafe ground for authority to rest on; and that, with the same facility with which it crouches to *power*, it may be made to minister to *faction:* —I will not urge that whatever conduces to the true interests of mankind, can have a solid foundation only in that knowledge which can *discern* those interests;—I will not urge that in a neighbouring country [a], where instruction has been spread almost universally amongst the lowest class, the

[a] The reader need scarcely be informed that the country here alluded to is Scotland, in which it is well known that decent demeanour, as well as superior intelligence, distinguishes the lower classes above those of any other part of the British empire. In no part of the world, perhaps, has education been more extended, and nowhere has there appeared more general industry and regularity.

blessings of industry, good order, and religious principle, have been found singularly to prevail;—these, and other considerations on the same head, I shall not *now* press upon your reflection, since the objection, whatever may be its weight, cannot with justice be applied to the proceedings of the Association. Had indeed the scheme of education originated with them, and had that scheme been confined to the communication of the bare elements of learning, without any of their more useful combinations, your institution might have been chargeable with the injurious consequences supposed to follow: but when, on the contrary, your part has been to direct the course of literary instruction, already established, to the most valuable objects; and to furnish the materials for the highest mental improvement, none but the *benefits* of the system can be ascribed to you, whatever, under other circumstances, may be its disadvantanges.

The knowledge, which it has been your great ambition to disseminate, is the knowledge of religion; and, to this end, what means more happily suited than those you have employed? In the address of last year, it was announced that a plan was then in contemplation for the distribution of Bibles amongst the lower classes—the number of Bibles to amount to 5000—to be sold at a reduced price—and to be distributed amongst Christians of all denominations, without distinction. I am happy now to inform you that this plan has been carried into effect—the number proposed has been contracted for, the greater part actually procured and circulated; and although the sum presented by the benevolent author of this scheme amounted only to £50, and not less than £1600 were requisite for its completion, yet so warmly has the beneficence of the original donor been seconded by the liberality of the public, that the Association has been encouraged to carry the plan yet farther, and to annex to it a scheme for sending into circulation a larger number of Testaments, for the more constant use of the younger parts of families; the speedy accomplishment of which there is every reason to expect; as a large proportion of those, on whom this cause of religion and humanity furnishes the strongest claims, yet re-

main to contribute their assistance. But may it not be hoped that this scheme may be carried to a yet greater extent? Nay, may it not be hoped that the continually growing benefits of its operation may at length place it upon a foundation, independent of individual munificence—and that the same superintending care, that provides for the peasant a *place* in which to worship his Creator, may also secure to him that invaluable book, which alone can teach him in *what manner* he is to be worshipped? Mean time, what *has* been accomplished must afford to every friend of virtue the highest satisfaction;—it goes at the same time to evince the efficacy of your exertions, and to confirm this truth, that no good cause, taken up with zeal and maintained with perseverance, can fail of ultimate success.

But, excellent as this work has been, your Association has not rested here;—it was not enough that the great truths of revelation should be placed before the eyes of the people; it was necessary that they should be read and relished. The books hitherto in use amongst the lower classes of our countrymen have been such as, falling in with their ignorance and their vices, could not but excite a distaste, and even incapacity, for every thing serious and instructive. To correct this false taste, and to create a relish for more wholesome nourishment, was an object worthy of your notice. For this purpose you have wisely devised the scheme of sending abroad, through the venders of cheap books intended for the use of the poor, small tracts, in which the principles of moral rectitude, and religious truth, are conveyed in the attractive form of *fable;* thus interesting curiosity in behalf of virtue, and blending with the entertainment of the fancy the correction of the heart. By this means moral truths become insensibly impressed upon the mind—the more serious and useful concerns of life are raised to their due importance—and whilst the general cause of virtue thus receives additional support, a taste and knowledge are diffused, that form the necessary preparatives for the profitable perusal of the great volume of our salvation.

"The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser

than the children of light"—and with them, we find, had originated this plan of popular instruction. They had dealt out their lessons in the most compendious form—and by their unhappy zeal in the service of *their* master, they had contrived that every cottager should be supplied with a cheap and portable system of impiety. Without some counteraction, what must be the consequence? Whilst the enemy had thus overrun the low grounds of society, was the supporter of Christianity to remain within his strongholds, and boast of his strength in fastnesses, which gave no command; and in armour, which was too cumbrous for action? No—we have learned wisdom from the foes of religion, we have armed ourselves with weapons fit for the encounter, and under the blessing of that great Being, who looks down with favour upon every effort in the cause of virtue, we *will* be successful. How far we have already succeeded may be inferred from the prodigious number of the tracts alluded to, which have been actually dispersed, amounting to not less than 100,000 in the space of the last twelve months—and it deserves to be remarked that these have not been scattered *gratuitously;* in which case they might have fallen in popular estimation, and would furnish no ground, from their *consumption*, whereon to estimate the degree of their *demand.*

What may be the benefits resulting from the prosecution of this plan it must be difficult to compute. May we not naturally expect that it will work an entire change in the manners of our populace? When books, inculcating lessons of industry, and virtue, and religion, are made to form the amusement of the old, and the instruction of the young, may we not expect, that though the obduracy of matured habits should resist the salutary impression, yet the rising generation will grow up under its influence; and that the feeling of utility, and the principle of right, will at length take place of that slovenly indolence, that improvident thoughtlessness, and that too prevalent disregard of honesty and truth, which have hitherto marked the lower classes of our people?

But here I cannot help observing, that in order to secure these invaluable consequences, the scheme must be prosecuted with a vigour and extension suited to the exigence. I have mentioned the number already dispersed,—and considering the lateness of the commencement, it is a large one; —but still "what is this amongst so many?" This would, at the most moderate computation, amount but to a single tract to every five families through the kingdom. To attain the desired end, they must be sent abroad, through every county, and town, and village, where there are any who can read; and in order to this, there must be a vastly larger fund than the Association, engaged in so many other expensive undertakings, can possibly supply; and every man of station, of influence and virtue, must become an active assistant in dispersing them; this, I scruple not to say, would produce an infallible effect;—and, let me add, that it is the concern of every man who values life, or liberty, or property, who loves his country, or who honours his God.

But whilst you were thus engaged in providing for the spiritual wants of your poorer brethren, you were not unmindful of their temporal necessities, and you thought it not unworthy of you, in the late season of threatened scarcity and distress, to employ your talents, and your knowledge, in communicating whatever information your experience or your reading might suggest, as to the modes by which a cheap and easy subsistence might be procured.

Nor have you confined yourselves to such publications as were suited only to the occasions of the *poor*. To have alleviated their present wants—to have taught them the value of cleanliness, and industry, and honesty, and truth—to have instilled into their minds the notion of utility and the sense of religion—to have thus prepared them for the profitable perusal of the holy scripture, and to have supplied them with that sacred book, for their final edification; these were objects worthy of your institution—and yet there remained a species of publication, whose object was too important to escape your discernment, and whose benefits should reach,

not merely to the peasant, but to him of less humble rank, and less limited attainments. The late growth of infidel writings, assuming a new shape, and decking themselves in all the colours of popular allurement, required a speedy counteraction. To this end, it was deemed expedient to send into general circulation such treatises as might most intelligibly, and at the same time briefly, vindicate Christianity from the malignant attacks of its adversaries. With a prudence which well became your wisdom, you determined not to anticipate the notoriety of those pernicious publications by the precipitancy of reply; and that their unhappy celebrity should be followed, not hastened, by their confutation; well knowing also, that the Christian faith had little to fear from the powers of reasoning displayed in such performances, and that the *true* cause of their adoption was to be sought in the *predisposition* of the public mind, from an ignorance of the sacred word, and an impatience of its restraints: you, with equal prudence, resolved, that however the urgency of the occasion might draw from you argumentative replies; on these you were by no means to rely, as your only, or even your principal strength. The general dissemination of the scriptures, and the religious education of youth, you rightly judged the truly efficacious mode of defence—at the same time you failed not to avail yourselves of the labours of those worthy persons, both in this and the neighbouring country, whose talents had been most successfully employed in counteracting those destructive doctrines which had been so industriously disseminated—and by printing cheap editions of tracts, both tending to establish the evidences of Revelation in general, and to repel the particular attacks which have been lately made upon it, by that well-known writer, who has even vulgarised infidelity, so as to fit it for the taste and comprehension of the very rabble; you have spread powerful antidotes throughout the land, so as to place them within the reach even of the poorest—and it is to be hoped that the exertions of *individual* members will complete this beneficent work, in the promoting of which, some

of them[a] have already shewn so exemplary a zeal—and by an active, and where necessary, a gratuitous distribution of these valuable tracts, make provision, that even the meanest peasant may be able, according to the apostolic direction, to give a reason of the hope that is in him.

But as it has been peculiarly the policy of modern infidels to strip religion of its sanctity, and to degrade the sacred books by heaping on them every epithet of scurrility and contempt—it appeared to you, that it might not be unprofitable to meet them on this very ground—and accordingly I find upon your journals, a measure resolved on, and I trust speedily to be executed, which may answer to this purpose —I mean the diffusion of tracts, calculated at the same time to enforce the excellence and true dignity of the sacred writings, and to retort on their calumniators the weapons of ridicule which they have insidiously, and but too successfully, employed against them, by pointing out the glaring and almost ludicrous absurdities that hang upon the several schemes that have been set up to the subversion of the Christian faith — and on this head, indeed, you have an ample field. When you find one of the redoubted champions of infidelity, boldly contending, that man is capable of arriving at absolute perfection in this present life, for which alone he is destined, and that the day is fast approaching, when the whole human race, having attained that glorious state, shall exult in unbounded freedom; knowing no law, and restrained by no government but that of individual reason—from the commencement of which happy era, the extinction of the passions is to *perpetuate* this perishable frame, and *human immortality* to crown the work. When you find another, with greater moderation, admitting the existence of what he calls a God, but denying him the power of communicating with his creatures—and whilst he rejects the

[a] Particularly the Lord Bishop of Elphin, at whose sole expense a most useful compendium of the evidences of the Christian religion, extracted from *Seed*, *Watson*, and *Paley*, has lately been published—to be distributed by the Association.

written word, as not suited to the *simplicity* of the unlearned, sending him to the abstract contemplation of the physical and moral world, for the *intuitive* knowledge of his Creator and his duty—when, I say, we find the adversaries of our faith seriously contending for these frenzies—and contending for them, as *essential* parts of their respective systems; could we refrain from smiling at such extravagant follies, were we not grieved to see that there are fools who can embrace even these absurdities, because they carry to the corrupt affections a release from the restraints of virtue and the terrors of religion?

But to return. Whilst you have been thus zealous in disseminating such works as might conduce to the instruction and improvement of the public mind, you have been not unprofitably employed in suppressing many that were *injurious*. To your vigilant interference do we owe it, that publications offensive to decency, and destructive of morals, are no longer openly vended—and to you are our youth indebted for rescuing them from that odious familiarity with vice, which fixes in a polluted imagination the basis of every thing that is unprincipled and dissolute.

Hitherto, I have confined myself to a view of the exertions of the Association, as directed to the reformation of *principle*. If I have dwelt rather largely upon this topic, I have to seek my excuse in the general importance of the subject—and I look particularly for *your* indulgence, as the measures to which I have alluded, being almost all of recent growth, prove that your operations are *progressive*—and that in such cases as depend *solely* upon the Association itself, and in which they are not merely to *recommend*, but to *act*, the work of virtue is not permitted to linger.

But let it not be supposed that, occupied, as you have been, in plans for the reformation of *principle*, you have in any degree neglected those that tend to the reformation of *practice*. No—the violation of the sabbath—the prevalence of the horrid crime of perjury—the mischiefs of lottery insurance—the gross abuse of spirituous liquors amongst the

lower orders—these, and the other flagitious practices, that openly disgrace society, are the unceasing objects of your deliberation and your hostility. But the different plans which your wisdom has suggested for the removal of these evils, have been already so amply detailed, that to the public, nothing remains to be added for information; and to you, nothing more can be needful, than to urge a persevering exertion for their accomplishment.

Upon the whole, my brethren, great have been your efforts in the glorious cause you have undertaken—and not inconsiderable has been your success—but to crown these efforts, and to complete the success, there is one thing indispensable—I mean EXAMPLE. This is, I may say, the very *soul* of your institution; this alone it is, that can give life and efficacy to your resolves—without this, all your regulations become dead letter; and your Association, sunk into merited contempt, and put aside as an impertinent intruder, will only serve to furnish matter of derision and triumph to the enemies of our religion; whilst to the friends of virtue, it must raise insuperable obstructions to any future attempt of a similar nature. Much then does it behove you, my brethren, to beware that your practice war not with your professions. Remember that you are as a city that is set upon a hill, and "cannot be hid"—remember, that you have *voluntarily* placed yourselves on that eminence—that you have *challenged* public observation, and taught the world to look to *your* lives and conduct for a proof of the excellence of that religion, by which you profess to be influenced—remember, then, that *every* instance of your personal misconduct is a wound to Christianity, and that, by evincing the inefficacy of the gospel upon the morals of its most ostensible advocates, you turn traitor to its Divine Author—and, like the perfidious disciple, deliver up the Lord of Life into the hands of his murderers.

Let us, then, my brethren, as we value the well-being of society, as we value the interests of religion, as we value our own eternal welfare—let us seriously consider the excellence of this our work, and the ruin of its failure—let us remember,

that whether our efforts for the reformation of others prove prosperous or ineffectual, we have taken upon ourselves this sacred obligation—that "as for us," we and our "house will serve the Lord." And let us humbly implore that God, without whom the strength of the mighty and the counsels of the wise are vain, to vouchsafe to us his assistance and protection, his guidance and his blessing—so that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in Him, we may glorify his holy name—and, finally, through his mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

A

SERMON

PREACHED IN

THE CHAPEL OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,

ON THURSDAY, THE 16TH OF FEBRUARY, 1797,

BEING THE DAY APPOINTED FOR

A NATIONAL THANKSGIVING

ON ACCOUNT OF THE

PROVIDENTIAL DELIVERANCE OF THIS KINGDOM

FROM THE LATE

THREATENED INVASION.

A

SERMON.

PROVERBS, xxi. 30, 31.

"THERE IS NO WISDOM NOR UNDERSTANDING NOR COUNSEL AGAINST THE LORD. THE HORSE IS PREPARED AGAINST THE DAY OF BATTLE: BUT SAFETY IS OF THE LORD."

THAT the success of all human endeavours ultimately depends, not on man, but on that Being from whom the powers of man have been derived—can be controverted only by such as madly presume to question the existence of an all controlling cause—approved by the reflection and confirmed by the experience of past ages. This momentous truth has been lately manifested to us of this nation, in characters so visible, and by proofs so convincing, that, not to discern it, were the extreme of blindness—not to acknowledge it, the deepest blackness of ingratitude.

To him who does not confess that, in our late deliverance from the horrors of war, heightened by the ferocities of a brutal and ensanguined enemy, the divine mercy has been our safeguard—who has not beheld, as it were, *the arm of the Lord bared* for our preservation—to him the solemnities of this day must pass away as idle and unmeaning pageantry;—and in the prayers and praises which the national gratitude is, at this moment, sending up to the throne of our Almighty Deliverer, *he* can take no part.

Amongst you, my Christian brethren, who are here assembled, I will hope that none such are to be found. I will hope that on this day, which our governors have appointed for one solemn and united expression of national thanksgiving—we have all met together, with feelings suited to the sacredness of the object and to the magnitude of the occasion—and, that there is not one of those who now hear me, who is not convinced, that *there is no wisdom nor understanding nor counsel against the Lord*—that although *the horse is prepared against the day of battle*, yet *of the Lord*, and of him only, *is safety*—THAT SAFETY, whereby we are now enabled to meet in this his temple, to invoke his protection, and to celebrate his praise.

That such conviction may not pass off with the feeling of the moment, but may operate with an efficacy proportioned to its importance—that it may not terminate with the present effusion of grateful adoration, but continue to work substantial and permanent improvement in our hearts and lives; let me entreat your attention in a serious examination of the truth which has been generally proposed as the subject of the present discourse—a truth, to which it concerns us, not merely to yield our assent, but which we should be careful to embody, in the habits of our thinking, and in the principles of our practice.

That a general superintending control is exercised by the Supreme Being in the conduct of human affairs—can be denied only by those who, excluding the Creator from our thoughts, would totally subvert the foundations of religion—to place an idle sceptre in the hands of him who governs the universe—is the insulting mockery of the modern Atheist, who *admits* the notion of a God but to deride it. But whilst this superintending control is necessarily maintained by all who are possessed of the first principles of religious belief; it has been contended by some, that its operations being conducted by fixed and general laws, no events are, consequently, to be ascribed to its *peculiar* interference—and that all being equally subject to its uniform and universal in-

fluence, it follows, that no particular occurences can be distinguished as PROVIDENTIAL.

Now, this position, so far as it goes to establish the necessary subjection of all events to an overruling Providence, is perfectly consistent with the deductions of reason and the discoveries of revelation;—but, inasmuch as it presumes that the workings of Providence are *uniform*, and that by the same unwearied means *all* its ends are attained—it is found directly contradictory to fact; and, in our daily experience, meets the fullest refutation. For, whilst we observe the great majority of events proceeding according to general rules, and answering to common expectation; do we not frequently discover others that seem to defy all previous calculation, and even to baffle all subsequent analysis of their causes—disappointing the toils and the hopes of the most persevering and sagacious contrivers—and often the very reverse of what the best devised and best executed schemes of human policy, had labour to accomplish?

Now of this inequality in the ways of Providence, what shall we venture to pronounce? What shall we say of effects, for which no adequate causes seem to exist—of those which flow from causes altogether independent of human agency —or of those which human agents have been found instrumental in producing by the very means designed for their counteraction? For what purpose shall we suppose these events to have been brought about, in a manner different from the ordinary course of nature; when that all powerful Being—in whose hands are the issues of life, and whose creative word could instantly supply agents and instruments to his will—might have permitted them to arise from the common operation of obvious and familiar causes? Is it not clear that these occasional deviations from the usual process of things, must have been purposely ordained to awaken mankind to reflection—to remind them of the true source of all their possessions, and to fix their attention on that Supreme Cause, which, in the exact and regular succession of worldly occurrences, might have passed unnoticed? That

so, whilst, on the one hand, a general uniformity has furnished a ground for reasonable expectation, and an incitement to industrious exertion—the anomalies of Providence, on the other, by pointing out the mover of the great machine, should draw back the thoughts of man from second causes to the first spring and principle of all—and thus, whilst we admit all events to be *equally* providential as to their *cause*, they are clearly not so as to their *effect*. Those which depart from the common course of things—like the comet, breaking in upon the uniformity of our system, though its seeming irregularities are derived from the same force and influenced by the same law with the planetary movements—most powerfully arresting our attention, and directing us to the contemplation of their source.

Now, what can be conceived more worthy of a beneficent Creator, than such an admixture of ordinary means and occasional interpositions[a], as should, at the same time, secure freedom to the agency of man, and yet remind him of his necessary dependence—at once incite him to an exertion of his powers, and yet prevent the success of that exertion from inflaming his pride and subverting his religion?

But if such be the methods of God's providence—and does not every suggestion of common sense, of philosophy, and of revelation, evince it?—what events, so likely to call forth those striking and extraordinary interpositions, as

[a] The terms *interposition, interference*, and such like, which, in their common acceptation, seem to imply exclusively an *immediate* exercise of the divine control, I feel myself justified in adopting, under a theory, which *equally* refers *all* events—as well those that follow in natural succession, as those that seem to digress from that order—to the same powerful cause, and to the same direct superintendence; for the distinction between *ordinary* and *extraordinary* occurrences, being as clear and striking—upon the supposition that they *equally* result from providential direction, and differ only in *the adoption of a different set of means*, as it can be on the vulgar idea, that the Deity *directly* interferes *only* in the latter class, leaving the former to the uniform operation of established laws—the terms, which, agreeably to this idea, are used to indicate the *immediate agency* of Providence, may, with perfect propriety, be applied to *that use of means*, which, according to the above theory, *brings to our view* that supreme agency, which equally extends to all the affairs of life—the *effect* being the same, whether Providence, in some cases only, *exerts* its peculiar operations, or in those alone renders its operations *visible*.

those by which the fate of nations and the well-being of communities are affected?—instruments of God's moral government, depositories of those moral causes, whereby collective masses of mankind are to be regulated and improved. It is in the superintendence of these that we are principally to look for those open and direct influences and overrulings, which are properly called providential—and as here they are chiefly to be expected, so they are most evidently to be discerned—the magnitude of the effect admitting the greater contrast and more manifest disproportion to the apparently operating cause. Thus when we see a great political revolution, wrought out of the jealousies of a favourite, or the turbulence of a demagogue—when we see the blowing of a wind, or the mistaking of a signal, deciding the fate of a powerful empire—can we doubt that this manifestation of God's might, through the weakness of his instruments, was intended to arouse the nations to a sense of their dependence; and to demonstrate to the sons of men, that in him alone they were to put their trust—that his alone *is the kingdom*, and that *he is the Governor amongst the nations.*

If we look to the great empires of the ancient world—if we look to the recorded administration of the divine government amongst the people of the Jews—if we look to yet nearer events, and trace in the history of our own nation, the past vicissitudes of its fortune—do we not everywhere find the fullest confirmation of this reasoning[a]—the grand purposes of Providence, attained by means seemingly inadequate to their completion—and the awful judgments of the Almighty, marked out by characters too plain to be misunderstood?

Or do we wish to look to the still more interesting and impressive lesson of our own experience? We shall there find the warnings of divine mercy, and the inflictions of unerring

[a] See these points fully and satisfactorily treated, by that excellent prelate, and distinguished writer, the present Bishop of London, in the beginning of his sermon preached before the House of Lords in England, January 30th, 1778.—Bishop Porteus's Sermons, Dublin edition, vol. ii. pp. 215—220. See also a sermon preached by the Rev. Richard Graves, in the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, January 1, 1797, pages 9—12.

justice, most fearfully and visibly displayed—the greater part of Christian Europe, convulsed by the most furious and destructive war,—the iniquities of the nations overflowing in the bitterness of God's wrathful displeasure,—commotions the most violent, and changes the most unheard of, disturbing the established order of political arrangement,—and *men's hearts* everywhere *failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth.*

If we apply to this alarming state of things the general principles that have been laid down, shall we not derive additional strength to our conclusions? Let a brief review of this eventful period convince us.

In casting our eyes, but a few years back, upon the moral and religious state of the countries of Europe, what do we for the most part discern, but the grossness of an impious superstition, disgracing the name of Christianity,—combining with the progress of a wicked philosophy, and the growth of a corrupting civilization, to overturn the system of God's moral government, and to efface from the mind of man the very idea of his Maker? The sublime truths of revelation, trampled by the great, scoffed by the philosopher, and trafficked by the priest, —the peasant even, forgetting the source of his consolations, —and the licentiousness of vice, everywhere sweeping down the barriers and mounds of religion? A system of such widespread and ruinous depravation—embracing in its extent a great proportion of that part of the world called Christian —can we suppose it consistent with the purity of the divine Ruler of the Universe, to permit to continue—to the defiance of his power—to the reproach of his justice—and to the utter subversion of his authority amongst men? Surely *for these things* the Lord *will visit,—on* nations *such as* these, *his soul will be avenged.* Has the Lord visited for these things? and has his vengeance been poured out?

Look, first, to that nation, whose refinements in every species of wickedness and impiety had procured to it an unquestioned preeminence in guilt—a nation, in which the voluptuousness of the higher ranks had dissolved every principle of moral

rectitude, and rejected even the decencies of external life —in which politeness was deemed the highest virtue; and the blush of nature, almost the only thing of which to be ashamed, and in which the triumph of profligacy had been so complete, that even its priests had become atheists, and its women debauchees. Behold this nation, thus distinguished by its vices, no less distinguished as the first and most signal example of the divine judgments. Behold it passing—with a rapidity, not to be sufficiently accounted for on common principles of nature—from one extreme of manners and opinions to its opposite—the sentiment of proud attachment to the prince, and of habitual submission to the higher orders of society, giving way at once before the most rancorous detestation of monarchy, and the most savage ferociousness of uncontrolled equality. Behold this new system, erecting itself amidst general carnage; and towering to the view of Europe on the slaughtered heaps of its infuriate votaries—each armed against the life of his neighbour—and the triumph and murderer of this day, but preparing a richer banquet of blood for the murderer of the next. Behold the sword of divine vengeance, yet reeking from the bowels of this ill-fated nation, next turned against other countries, whose vices and irreligion had long challenged the judgments of the Almighty; —see it, whilst executing the decrees of infinite justice against itself, employed to enforce them against the surrounding people;—see it spreading amongst them the desolation of its arms, and of its doctrines, not less destructive than its arms; —see it sending forth a tumultuous rabble, against the most powerful and well ordered array—opposing anarchy to discipline—rashness to experience—and bankruptcy to national wealth;—see the powers of Europe united against this monstrous disturber of all civilized society; and see it, *against all human calculation*, TRIUMPHANT—see it triumphant, by a concurrence of events too wonderful and too significant not to mark the true source of its success—see the very elements contributing their aid; as if he who rules the times and seasons were concerned to promote its conquests; and

see, at length, the political map of Europe entirely changed, by its victorious progress—see it adding province after province to its dominions—see two independent nations already swallowed up by its all devouring ambition, and a third, whose corruptions of religion and dissoluteness of morals have long provoked the vengeance of the Almighty, deluged with the blood of contending armies, and, at this moment, apparently tottering to its ruin.

When we look, I say, to all these things, to the discomfiture of the most powerful combinations of force by means, according to all human measure, inadequate,—to the almost miraculous concurrence of events, not depending upon human agency,—to the general depravation of those countries which have fallen a sacrifice to this universal invader,—and to the departure from the genuine principles of Christianity, unhappily too prevalent in all;—can we have a doubt that this overbearing power has been employed as a scourge against the apostacy of the Christian world, and that the evils of its infliction are the dread judgments of a long neglected and long suffering God, whereby those nations, whose measure of iniquity is full, have been already visited, and others, not yet ripe for dissolution, are warned from the ruin of their ways?

Would to God, my brethren, that we of THIS ISLAND could plead our righteousness, in exemption from those terrors that have overspread the European continent, and that in the review of our national transactions *we* could discern no instances of neglected mercy, no indications of divine resentment! But when we look back, and consider that, after a long enjoyment of the blessings of peace, after a full and rich increase of the wealth and comforts of our people, the sunshine of prosperity has only served to draw forth amongst us the rank weeds of irreligion; and that in place of that grateful piety and tranquil satisfaction, with which the divine mercies should have been received and cherished, our vices have kept pace with our advancement, and plenty has been found but to heighten our discontent; when such has been the return for the unexampled favours that have been heaped

upon this nation, might it not have been expected that this abuse of the goodness of Providence would be succeeded by the severity of its judgments? and was it then to be wondered, that the turbulence of faction, and the machinations of treason, should be permitted to disturb the national repose? Was it to be wondered, that the neglect of religion should be followed by a contempt of all authority, and that in the too general rejection of the sovereignty of the Most High, the great principle of subordination being lost, the several parts of the community should be convulsed in mutual conflict,—the arms of the lower orders turned against their superiors, and the supporters of legitimate authority silenced and overborne, by the furious demagogues of rebellion?—and was a *criterion* wanting to prove to us that these manifold calamities had issued from the decrees of an insulted God? Was it not manifest in various ways?—was it not manifest, even by this one convincing proof, that the immediate instruments by which these evils were brought upon us were men, whose lives and conversation were a continued defiance of the Almighty,—men, who whilst they assumed the glorious, but much abused, name of PATRIOT, to blow the trumpet of discord with more direful effect, were everywhere seen openly to disavow religion and their God, and who, as professed enemies of the Most High, could naturally have been deemed the bearers of nothing but his wrathful inflictions?

All these, however, though to every serious and enquiring mind they were evidently the chastisements of the Almighty, and the warnings of his displeasure; yet, because they *seemed* the result of near and obvious causes, led not our thoughts to their true and genuine source. Human correctives alone we looked to for their removal—and, whilst the chastenings of the Lord were held out, to admonish us of the danger of our ways, and we beheld the surrounding nations visited by his heaviest inflictions, we still continued, equally heedless of his wrath, and insensible to his goodness.

Far removed from the storm of war that had burst upon the continent of Europe—long undisturbed by any foreign enemy

—and secure in our insular situation, whilst other nations were made to tremble for their very existence, we proudly deemed ourselves beyond the reach of danger. Long and often had we been entreated to turn from the evil of our ways; long and often had we been warned, that the visitations of an offended God would at length find us out, and severely punish our transgressions; but that such *national* consequences should follow from our *individual* sins, we presumed to be but the idle prognostics of the speculative moralist, or the intimidating fabrications of the interested divine—and whilst we reposed on present security, we continued to insult the mercies of him who bestowed it. What then remained, but that either we should be *crushed*, under the weight of divine vengeance, as no longer a fit subject for his mercies—or that *one open and decided act of providential interference* should be yet displayed, for our further trial and possible reformation? Blessed be God! the merciful part of the alternative has been our lot; and to celebrate this signal act of divine goodness it is that we have this day assembled. The characters of its mighty Author are plainly legible to all, and nothing but the backwardness of our gratitude can impede the fulness of our conviction. The eager violence of a furious enemy has been permitted to reach our coasts, but to be dashed away by the same hand that had conducted it. The skirts of the tempest, which we had hitherto only heard and neglected as the voice of distant thunder, have been allowed to sweep our shores. That cruel scourge, under which other nations had bled for their offences, has been, at the same moment, presented and withdrawn—thus evidently to remind us of that power whom we had too long forgotten—who is mighty both to save and to destroy, and who willeth not the death of sinners, but that all should repent and live.

Does infidelity suggest that there has been nothing in this transaction that does not fall within the ordinary course of nature? Let it take its answer from the estimate of the probability *antecedent* to the event. Do we not, all of us, remember the very idea of an intended descent upon our coasts,

ridiculed as visionary and absurd? Most ridiculed by the very description of persons who would now deny all extraordinary interference; notwithstanding that, in the *wildness of the notion*, they could at first discern nothing but the fabricated alarm of a corrupt administration; and that, fortified by the *utter inconceivableness of the event*, their incredulity was long able to stand its ground against the notoriety of its completion [a]. Do we not all of us remember when the *weakness of our fears* would have been derided, had we conceived it within the ordinary, or (morally speaking) the possible course of events, that a nation, whose finances were exhausted, whose navy was almost annihilated, whose people were unused to maritime concerns, should yet be able suddenly to send forth a numerous and well appointed fleet, to brave us on our very coasts,—whilst protected by a power whose ships cover the seas, and whose mariners are used to rule the deep? Still more had we conceived, that this armament—in defiance of unwearied vigilance, in defiance of one overpowering force stationed to mark and repress its earliest movements; and of another, waiting but the signal of its approach to bring upon it instant destruction—should yet have steered through all these imminent and surrounding dangers, and have passed safe and unmolested to our shores?

[a] It is a fact deserving of notice, that so strongly had the utter improbability of an attempt to invade this country taken possession of the minds of many, that during the entire period of the enemy's stay upon our coasts, (which was not less than three weeks,) and for some time after their departure, there were found not a few amongst us, who in defiance of universal report, of every circumstance of credibility—of the very language of the thing itself (the production of a French prisoner, cast upon the coast by the violence of the storm, who confessed the designs and the presence of the enemy)—were yet able to withhold their belief, and utterly to discredit the whole as a fabrication. This fact is not more deserving of remark, as a proof of the degree of unlikelihood, which calculation on ordinary principles had attached to the idea of our invasion, than as an instance of the power of certain predispositions over the mind, to create and fortify an unbelief, which no force of testimony, and scarcely any evidence of sense, can overcome. It becomes those, then, who, on a subject infinitely more important than that we at present treat of, would shelter themselves from criminality in their unbelief, by the pretence that their assent depends in no measure on themselves, but is the pure and necessary result of the proofs laid before them—to examine carefully whether such *predispositions* war against their belief.

And shall we, when antecedently it would have been deemed the extreme of folly to have ranked these within the ordinary course of events, shall we now reverse that judgment? No! —the wonders of the divine interposition are too manifest to be mistaken. The natural order of events has been evidently disturbed to mark out the true source of our preservation—our fleets have been withheld from victory, that our deliverance might come from God—and that, used as we have been to look to second causes for our security, and to build our strength upon our own resources, we might be reminded, that SAFETY IS ONLY OF THE LORD.

It becomes us to reflect, with feelings of heartfelt gratitude and reverential awe, that had that overruling power—which in other cases had rendered the elements subservient to the designs of our formidable invaders; which had bound up Holland in chains of ice to deliver it into their hands; and which can still the raging of the sea and subdue the winds with a word—had that power, I say, vouchsafed to them a calm and favourable season—had it not, on the contrary, collected against them all the furies of the storm—of a storm accompanied by severities which this climate has seldom experienced, and which, combined in all their circumstances, but few of us have ever witnessed—what must have followed? I will not assert that we must have fallen a prey to our ferocious enemy—I will not presume to say that the valour of my brave countrymen would have proved insufficient finally to repel the foe; but this at all events must be admitted, that, however ardent that valour,—however prompt their zeal, (and surely in no instance could either have been surpassed,) however splendid the success, that might ultimately crown the arms of our national protectors—yet much of carnage—of cruelty—of terror—and of unhappiness must have attended the conflict;—thus, not only from *possible* defeat and ruin, but from *certain* bloodshed and misery, have we been protected—the shield of Providence has been held over our island, and danger and dismay have been averted.

May we not, then, humbly presume, from this instance of

the divine mercy, thus *openly* interposing in our behalf, that we have not yet arrived to that *full measure of national guilt*, against which the principles of God's moral government might require the last overwhelming stroke of divine vengeance to be directed? Whilst we stand, then, in this awful situation—placed between the judgments which have been sent to *warn*, and those which hereafter may be ordained to *crush* us,—it behoves us most seriously to ponder our ways—it behoves us seriously to consider, not only the many and great vices by which we have provoked the displeasure of our heavenly Father; but also, those parts of our national character which, peradventure, have saved us from being utterly consumed;—that, whilst a review of the former may quicken us to repentance, the contemplation of the latter may animate us in the progress of well doing—by convincing us, that any improvement of the talent intrusted to us, however small, will be sure to meet its proportional reward.

On this latter topic, however, it becomes us to think and speak with deep humility; and whilst I glance at some few circumstances of distinction, whereby this nation *may* have been recommended to the divine protection, let me not be thought to encourage the pharisaic pride, which would assume merit from supposed superiority; but let me be rather considered as pointing out the unworthiness of our best exertions, and the necessity of instant and earnest efforts after further improvement. Not to dwell, then, upon the acts of charity, for which this country has been eminently conspicuous, but which, as being equivocal in their motives, and local in their causes, may have but little connexion with the vital principles of Christianity—not to insist upon our remoteness from that *extreme* of corruption to be found in those countries, in which the severity of God's judicial inflictions has been displayed—not to seek shelter from the reflection, that neither the abominations of FRENCH ATHEISM, the idolatries of FLEMISH SUPERSTITION, the dissoluteness of ITALIAN IMPIETY, nor the unchristian selfishness of DUTCH AVARICE, have so far prevailed amongst *us*, as to

render us *radically* incapable of promoting the purposes of God's moral government—not to rely upon the superiority of our constitution over that of every other country upon earth, in the security it affords to mental and personal freedom, in the encouragements it offers to virtue, and the rewards it holds out to meritorious exertion, in the even-handed distribution of justice, and in the production of individual and general happiness—not to dwell on these points, on which our self-partiality would probably draw us into error and presumption; let me direct your attention to that inestimable possession, which alone, perhaps, has rendered this, and the sister kingdom, objects of the divine regard; and the contemplation of which, far from exalting our pride, must inspire us with the sentiments of true humility. Let me remind you, that there exists among us, the *basis* of a pure, a rational, and enlightened religion; and though we are far, indeed, from having acted up to its dictates; though our higher ranks have been found, too frequently, to deride its doctrines and disdain its control; though the majority of our lower classes are used to revere it, under the mask of that superstition, which has so foully disfigured its genuine features —though even its teachers have, in many cases neglected, and in some disgraced, the sacredness of their profession—yet—thank God! there are many, very many, amongst us, who, in defiance of modern dissipation, and philosophic novelties, sincerely worship the Lord *in spirit and in truth* —thank God! there is to be found amongst us, the *principle* of religious reformation—a principle, not inoperative, but productive of effects which have already begun to display themselves, and whose fruits will, I trust, in due time, scatter their sweetness through the land—already has it sent forth, an[a] association of Christians, in defence of Christianity—men earnest to instruct in the truths and to encourage in the practice of true religion—already has it added to the zeal

[a] The Association for discountenancing Vice and promoting the Practice of Religion and Virtue, instituted in the year 1792, and at this time consisting of not less than 500 members, of whom the greater part are of the clergy, and the remainder includes some of the most respectable and distinguished of the laity.

and efficacy of our clergy, quickening them in the pursuit and propagation of that knowledge, which can alone *make wise unto salvation*—and, aided by the regulations[a] of our University, which, sanctioned by the heads of our Establishment, have afforded the means, and induced the necessity, of a due preparation for the clerical office—may we not hope to see it, one day, raise up a national clergy, the true and faithful ministers of Christ, and the uncorrrupted preachers of his word?

With these present advantages, and future prospects, may we not then humbly hope, that we are not yet become that useless instrument, which should be rejected as no longer conducive to the providential economy—and since the *fact* has proved, that our heavenly Father, far from abandoning us to our own devices, has openly called us to the notice of his warnings, and by a signal mark of his protection, invited us to return to his ways—shall we not anxiously labour to cultivate and improve those feelings that may secure to us the continuance of his mercy? Shall we not pay to our almighty Deliverer that tribute which alone he will accept—the tribute of national reformation—the sacrifice of true religion?

Let us then on this day, on which we profess to have met together to celebrate our deliverance, and to offer up our united praises and thanksgiving to its divine Author—let us, every one, determine to put away sin, and all ungodliness—to promote by our example and instructions, the practice of true religion—to spread throughout the land, a serious and reverential feeling of its importance—and to manifest by our lives and conversation, the inestimable value of its effects: this is the true celebration of God's praises—this the incense of thanksgiving which he will propitiously accept; and as it is by this alone we can express our present gratitude, so it

[a] The regulations here alluded to are those, whereby certain courses of lectures in divinity are required to be attended by the students, *after* they have answered for the degree of Bachelor of Arts; without a certificate of a regular and profitable attendance of which, the Bishops have wisely resolved not to give admission into holy orders.

is by this alone we can ensure our future preservation. *God will not be mocked*, nor will his *Spirit for ever strive* with us. The very means of improvement, which are now in our power, will, if neglected, prove our condemnation—and if, after the mercies we have experienced, we awake not to a just sense of our condition, the hope of our safety as a nation, no less than of our eternal welfare as individuals, is gone. All the experiments of Providence have been tried upon our case; their failure places us beyond remedy. Let us think, then, my brethren, before it be too late, *how dreadful a thing it is, to fall into the hands of the living God—let us search and try our ways, and turn again unto the Lord*—convinced, that however we may *prepare the horse against the day of battle*, HE is *our strong refuge and tower from the enemy*, and that without Him there can be no SAFETY.

[a]And now, before I conclude, let me address to you, my YOUNGER BRETHREN, a few reflections which the occasion peculiarly suggests. It has been *your* lot to be reserved for times the most momentous that have ever employed the pen of the historian—times yet more momentous are, perhaps, opening with the dawn of your rising manhood—the shock of moral causes has disturbed the frame of human affairs, and it is not now to be expected that things will go on as they have hitherto done. You may, perhaps, be destined for trials that shall call forth all the energies of your nature, and on *your* fortitude, *your* virtue, and *your* wisdom, may depend the crisis of a convulsion involving the liberty, the religion, and the happiness of your country. From amongst you are to arise the legislators and the clergy of the land; they who are to defend the legal rights of the individual by their eloquence, and to protect the nation by the sword, are all to issue from your ranks. Think, then, I beseech you, how important, how perilous your station!—the fate of the rising generation, the laws, the religion, the existence of your country, resting upon *your* exertions. Think that *now*, at this

[a] The part of the discourse which follows, being applied to the students, was delivered in the College chapel only.

very period of your lives, you are forming that character of mind with which you will be called to meet whatever perils may await you, and that as you improve or neglect the present opportunities, you may be preparing either for the support or the subversion of civilized society. It is not now, as in unruffled times, when the stagnation of human things might have permitted you to sink into harmless insignificance in the community; the powers and passions of the mind, partaking the agitations of the day, will not admit a neutrality of effect, and you will either be actively beneficial or positively injurious to society. Let me conjure you, then, my brethren, to reflect that, for *whatever* trials you may be destined, there *can* be but one preparation—that God, who hath so wonderfully preserved you from a late threatened calamity, hath clearly pointed out to you what is to be the great rock of your dependence. Learn betimes to trust to him who is mighty to protect you—learn betimes that in him alone *there is safety.* At this day, when a wildness of speculation and a profligacy of practice have so disordered and convulsed the moral world, and when the political face of Europe exhibits so many of those awful *signs* which portend some *great and terrible day of the Lord*, that there seems good reason to apprehend some wondrous and eventful change. Determine resolutely, to lay fast hold on that which alone can sustain you under the tremendous crash. Remember, that you are not only called on by the high stations in society which you may hereafter fill, and by the decisive influence which, in those several stations, your characters and your practice will command; but that you are here furnished with those means of improvement that must render your misconduct in future life tenfold criminal. Not only is the page of knowledge here opened to your view, and every inducement of honour and of interest held out to stimulate to its careful perusal—not only is religious instruction sedulously pressed upon your attention—not only is your youthful ardour animated in the pursuit of what is every way honourable and praiseworthy and good; but what must give

life and efficacy to all, you are here trained up in the habits of *discipline* and *subjection*, without which, be assured, no character can be truly noble and virtuous. Rely upon it, the man who *will* not be governed by others, *cannot* govern himself; and the mind that has grown up under impatience of restraint, must be destitute of real greatness; for, believe me, my young brethren, there is a true pride in submission, and a dignity in unconstrained obedience, which the display of high spirit in resistance of authority, whilst it affects, proves to be wanting. Believe me, that in such habits, you must lay the ground work of real magnanimity, and that in such habits, bestowing firmness to your religion, and constancy to your patriotism, you will make the best preparation for whatever events may impend. Remember, that in throwing off the principle of *subordination* have originated all the evils and disasters of the present day. The tendency to reject what is enjoined, *because* it is enjoined, is that which has produced the Infidel and the Traitor. To counteract, then, this destructive tendency, by habits of early discipline, is indispensable to our religion and our constitution; let it be the effort of your patriotism and your virtue to confirm and cultivate such habits. Already has your patriotic ardour been displayed; already have you, with a zeal well suited to your youth, your education, and your future prospects, started forward in the moment of danger to unite with your gallant fellow-citizens in the defence of our common country; and, with no small degree of pride, let me add, that the moderation and regularity[a] with which your conduct has been distinguished, under this temporary departure from academic habits, have proved you no less worthy of the glorious cause in which you had engaged, than the readiness with which, on the removal of the public pressure, you have transferred

[a] The author of this discourse considers the testimony here borne to the propriety and well regulated demeanour of the students, since their enrolment as a military association, to be a debt which justice demands; and to this declaration he is the more forcibly impelled, because, from his office as junior dean, having immediate cognizance of all collegiate offences, he has had occasion to be the more strongly impressed by the fact.

your attention to your proper studies, has shewn you deserving of the confidence and esteem of your academic superiors.

Such have been the first auspicious efforts of your patriotism; but a nobler and more exalted patriotism is now demanded of you—a patriotism whereby you will not only preserve your country, but save your own souls—the *patriotism* of RELIGION. Without this, be assured, all your exertions are vain. If God give us not *help from trouble, vain is the help of man;* and *unless the Lord keep the tower, the watchman waketh but in vain.* Let us then *be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked: and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.*

A

SERMON

OCCASIONED BY

THE DEATH OF JOHN, EARL OF CLARE,

LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND,

AND

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY.

DELIVERED IN

THE CHAPEL OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,

ON SUNDAY, THE 7TH OF FEBRUARY, 1802.

A

SERMON.

Isaiah, xxxviii. 1.

"SET THINE HOUSE IN ORDER: FOR THOU SHALT DIE, AND NOT LIVE."

We have here the awful warning, which Isaiah was commissioned to deliver to Hezekiah, king of Judah: a warning, which will appear the more awful, when we consider it addressed to one who was in the full possession of those enjoyments, which render men most reluctant to part with life. Every good, which this world could afford, was subservient to his wishes. Rank, prosperity, power, all ministered (as far as such things can minister) to his happiness: and in the prime of life, and vigour of habitual activity, the Jewish prince might probably have felt a secret confidence, which whispered the sanguine promise, of a lengthened tenure of these blessings. He probably, like the rich man in the Gospel, had, in the fulness of his heart, exulted in the prospect of *much goods laid up for many years;* and like him, in the moment of his exultation, he receives the sad and unexpected intelligence, that his soul was forthwith required of him: For, *in those days, Hezekiah became sick unto death; and the prophet came unto him, and said, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order: for thou shalt die, and not live.*

This admonition of the Prophet, which was graciously de-

signed to excite to the most awakened feeling, and to animate to the most earnest preparation for the momentous event which he had announced, although immediately directed to the Jewish king, yet is no less applicable to all, of whatever period or condition of life. The denunciation it contains is but the repetition of the original sentence, which has passed on every son of Adam, *Thou shalt die and not live:* and, as the things of early times have *happened for ensamples, and have been written for our instruction;* that warning, which the Prophet delivered to Hezekiah, I shall not hesitate to address to every one of you, my brethren, who hear me this day.

In vain is it that each may, in his heart, endeavour to frame distinctions between his individual case and that of the Jewish prince: in vain is it that imagination, recoiling from an idea so repulsive as that of approaching dissolution, may suggest every topic of dissimilitude: "He, to whom the admonition in the text was given, was first visited with disease; you are in the possession of health and strength, and most of you in the animating vigour of youth:—his sickness being *unto death*, he was on the point of closing life; of you, many are but commencing its career, none perhaps feel cause to apprehend its immediate termination." Yet, under these, and as many other circumstances of unlikeness, as an interested ingenuity can discern or devise, I must still repeat to each the solemn warning of the prophet, *Set thine house in order: for thou shalt die, and not live.*

For, consider for a moment, what is the space that interposes between us and the grave? What is the basis on which, the youngest and the strongest among us, can build his hopes, that he is not of the number of those whose souls shall be straightway demanded by him who gave them? Does any one require to be reminded of the shortness and the uncertainty of life? Can any one, in this place, require to be told, that in those pages, in which are contained the words of truth and wisdom, those parts of nature which are most fleeting, momentary, and vanishing, are exhausted, to

supply representations of the shortness, the uncertainty, and the vanity, of human life. *The vapour that appeareth for a little time, and then vanishes away—the wind that passeth, and cometh not again—the post that hasteth by—the shadow that passeth away—the tale that is told—the remembrance of a guest, who tarrieth but a day—the flowers, and the grass of the field, which flourish in the morning, and in the evening are cut down and withered—the path of a ship through the waters—the flight of a bird—the track of an arrow in the air.* These, and numerous other such images, have the sacred writers accumulated, in their endeavour to convey some faint idea of the nothingness of the life of man. Wherefore have they done so? Are men ignorant of the precarious tenure by which they hold existence? Do they not know, that *man who is born of a woman, is of few days?* Does not the flight of the time that has already past, and which now seems as it were a dream, satisfy the experience of each that even though his life should be extended to its utmost natural boundary, yet is it but a short period; in retrospect, how short! Does he need to be apprized of the unlikelihood of his attaining even that limit, when all nature, every surrounding object, every hour's acquaintance with himself, but supply one continued lesson of mortality? Do not the numbers of all ages, that we see daily fall on every side; do not the diseases, that so commonly occur within the circle of our friends, and that not unfrequently assail ourselves; do not the accidents, that continually threaten us; do not even the refreshments of nature, which are demanded by its continual decays, and applied to repair the incessant waste of life; do not those very actions, which, whilst they constitute a great part of the employment of existence, are intended but for its preservation; do not all these, announce to us the important truth contained in the text? Do they not prove, that we should think of ourselves as standing on the very brink of the grave? Do they not, consequently, render all remonstrances on the

shortness and incertitude of life, nugatory, because superfluous?

So it should naturally be imagined: and yet, strange to say, whilst there are no truths more inevitable, and none more readily admitted by all, than that death is certain, and that life is fugitive; whilst, at the same time, reason, revelation, and the natural apprehensions of man, bear united testimony to the awfulness of that change which death brings with it; yet there are no truths to which it is more requisite to recall the memory, by frequent repetition and powerful enforcement.

Truth does not necessarily operate in proportion to its reception. What has been always known and often said, as it impresses the mind with no new images, at length fails to excite attention, and is allowed to become obsolete, and to lie unheeded in the memory. The very notoriety of the fact is converted, in the present case, into the means of its neglect: and because it has cost men neither reasoning nor meditation, to be satisfied that they must shortly die; they omit the reflection altogether as too trivial and obvious for consideration, and live as if it were never to happen.

Thus, whilst a beneficent Providence, watchful for our eternal happiness, has spread around and planted within us so many images and memorials of our mortality, to present to us a constant warning of that irrevocable change to which we are hourly hastening; we abuse those very remembrances to the defeat of the divine intentions: and by a criminal neglect, of what Providence has (we may say) taken so much pains to impress, we resist the plans and insult the goodness of God; and that, in a matter involving no less than our everlasting salvation.

That we should thus remain insensible to what is perpetually obtruded on our view, argues an infatuation, whose existence might well be questioned, did not daily experience convince us of the fact. It is true, indeed, that reflection on the short and uncertain period of life, is not an employ-

ment to which the mind recurs for solace or diversion; it supplies no matter for self-gratulation; it offers no hope of immediate delight. It is one of those intellectual medicines, which, though highly beneficial, the fastidiousness of nature prompts us to refuse. What is salutary, however, should not be rejected, because it is unpalatable. The grave is a fearful subject for all, even the best, to contemplate: and if, by turning away our eyes, we could escape it, to do so would not then be chargeable with absurdity. But since it is the unavoidable lot of all, whether we look upon it or not; and since what lies beyond it, must be determined by the manner in which we approach it; is it not the height of frenzy to rush forward, blindfold to our danger, and heedless of our ruin? The traveller, if not destitute of understanding, will carefully view the way before him, whatever be the dangers that threaten, or the difficulties that obstruct; so in the pilgrimage of life, whoever is not regardless of his safety, will proceed with his eyes open, intent to see the whole of his state, not in the false colouring of a fond fancy, but according to the truth of divine destination.

It should also be remembered, that the fearfulness which shuts its eyes against the evil it apprehends, whilst it increases the danger, heightens the terror. Industriously, then, to fly the thoughts of death, can only serve, by an augmented dread, to make death insupportable when it comes: whilst, on the contrary, courage being improved by a familiar intercourse with danger, by the frequent contemplation of death, we contract as it were an intimacy with its terrors, and are enabled to meet its advance with resignation, firmness, and composure. It is in vain that, in the public offices of our church, we offer up our prayers against the calamity of a *sudden death;* if, in our conduct, we take care that no other awaits us, by omitting those provisions, and preparations of mind, without which it must, in the worst sense, *come upon us unawares.*

In every view of the case, then, it is highly necessary that our thoughts should be directed to the subject of mortality.

It is salutary, and therefore to be recommended: it is unpalatable, and therefore to be enforced: it is unnoticed from its very familiarity, and therefore requires to be impressed anew. All are so occupied with life, that they seem not to recollect that there is such a thing as death. One man forgets it in his business, another in his amusements; one in eager enjoyment of to-day, another in solicitous contrivance for to-morrow. Some die amidst the gratifications of luxury; and some, in the tumult of contests undecided, and purposes uncompleted. Warnings are multiplied, but without notice. *Wisdom crieth in the streets*, but is rarely heard. The occupations of the world easily justle from the mind the unwelcome thoughts of death and judgment: and many, even of those who profess to lead Christian lives, rest altogether satisfied with what this world can afford them; not indeed, that they doubt, but forget, a future state; not that they disbelieve their own immortality, but that they never consider it.

To such men, how necessary is it to proclaim, again and again, the shortness of human life, the vanity of its acquisitions, and the fleetingness of its enjoyments. How necessary it is to remind the man, whose whole attention converges to this world, that even were every one of his attempts successful, and every one of his wishes completed, yet, after all, he has obtained only empty pleasure which he cannot keep, at the expense of eternal happiness, which, if now neglected, he can never gain?

Whilst worldly men, indeed, enjoy the sunshine of prosperity; whilst they feel no wants or sorrows, to call them to the remembrance of their true condition; whilst, on every side, plenty surrounds, pleasure invites, and appetite impels; whilst they forget their Benefactor, in the multitude of the good things he has bestowed; whilst the giver is concealed, as it were, by the very cloud of his gifts, and the gross atmosphere of their earthly desires and gratifications intercepts the view of heaven and heavenly things, these remonstrances may fail of their effect: whilst their ears are filled with

the sounds of pleasure, and their hearts with the delights of sense, it is not wonderful that they will close the former against the grating tones of admonition, and reject from the latter, the bitter remembrance of death, judgment, and eternity.

There are, however, seasons when, upon the most heedless or the most averse, these unwelcome recollections will force their way. When affliction has been employed as the messenger of the divine warnings: when the heart has been touched with compassion, softened through sorrow, or struck with terror, by the nearer view of calamities or death: when the ravages of the destroyer have spread not only into our neighbourhood, but penetrated our very dwellings:—when, by an unexpected stroke, we find ourselves severed from the companions of our youth, the intimates endeared to our age, the relatives connected to us by the closest and tenderest ties:—when those with whom all our pleasurable reflections are associated; who had been used to share in all our joys, and sympathise in all our sorrows; on whose fidelity and affection we had been accustomed to unburthen and repose our minds, when agitated by the disappointments or wearied by the cares of life; when those with whom all our habits and all our enjoyments have been interwoven have vanished, and are no more:—when on a friend, perhaps on more than a friend, we have seen the grave to close for ever, leaving the world but as one great blank, and the heart but as one vast void; whilst no consolation seems to remain but in that very grave which encloses what we had loved, and in that eternity which alone can restore what we have lost:—then, indeed, and on occasions such as these, those awful truths, which have been so long forgotten or repelled, will powerfully recur. When the judgments of the Lord are thus abroad, they cannot be overlooked: and what men have hitherto refused to see, they are now compelled to feel. On occasions such as these, the voice of the preacher will be heard: the warning of the prophet will not pass unheeded.

And surely such occasions are not wanting at this day.

For when, in the recollection of those who now hear me, have the domestic visitations of the Almighty been more numerous or more awful? What family, within the range of our acquaintance, that has not had either to mourn the loss, or to rejoice over the unhoped recovery of some beloved member? Has not death been brought, as it were, to the doors of every one of us? and has not even the youngest, and the most unthinking, been made to fear, either in himself or in some near connexion, from the prevalence of the late mortality?

In the deprivations, which a period of not many months has so abundantly witnessed, this place too has had its share. Many who were but commencing the career of existence; young, sanguine, ardent; rejoicing to run the course of life; full of the hopes, and elated by the buoyancy of youth:—many, distinguished by their academic exertions:—many, beloved for their endearing qualities:—many, putting forth the early and vigorous promise of a respectable and useful manhood:—many such have been suddenly snatched away from the midst of their associates, and have left behind them only the wholesome lesson, that even the youngest is not exempt from death; that he too is called upon to set his house in order; and that he is bound to remember his Creator in the days of his youth, for that he knows not how soon his God will call him into judgment.

But we have not only had, within the short interval that has lately passed, to lament the loss of those in whom the fair blossom was but knitting into the fruits of manly virtue; we have had also, at no very distant period, to deplore the loss of one in whom those fruits had been brought to full perfection and to a rich maturity. Little more than two years have elapsed since we were solemnly assembled in this place, to discharge the last sad duties to him who had so long been the parental guardian of this seminary; to him, whom all who had a judgment to estimate, or a heart to feel what was valuable in life, must remember with respect and veneration:—a man whose unostentatious virtues sought no recompense

from the applause of men; whose life beamed forth through his retirement, a silent and modest example of all that was truly great and sincerely pious:—a man, whom no adversity could shake, no prosperity seduce:—a man, in whom the strictness of discipline was combined with the suavity of benevolence; the greatest solidity of understanding, with the most diffident exertion of its powers; and the widest extent of erudition, with the most perfect indifference to literary fame. To this exemplary character, a subject like the present naturally leads us to look back with the sensations of a fond regret. As academics, as men, and as Christians, we may contemplate it with satisfaction and advantage. We must feel, of a man so gifted, that however confined the immediate sphere of his operations, his life was a public benefit, his death a general loss—and his memory should with us at least be a sacred deposit. Yet all these virtues and excellencies are now to us but as a pleasing dream; and their possessor has mingled in that dust, to which all, however eminent, however accomplished, however virtuous, must unavoidably return.

But do we feel less affected by this instance of mortality, as derived from a case in which the ordinary period of human life was nearly exhausted? Let us then turn our eyes to an event more recent, more melancholy, and more impressing. Let us revolve the fate of that distinguished member of this Society, whose superiority of talent, activity of mind, and ardor in the pursuit of knowledge, had secured for him a literary rank, which few men in later times have attained; whilst the unassuming and playful simplicity of his manners seemed to mark him unconscious of his various and great endowments. Of this our departed brother, whose purity of character, and innocency of life, had rendered him the object of general respect and love; even you, my young friends, cannot have forgotten what was so lately told you from this place. I shall, therefore, only recall your attention to that part of his history which exhibits the most striking lesson of the futility of all earthly possessions and enjoyments. For

this purpose, then, you must view him, in reward of his long acknowledged merits, elevated to the highest ecclesiastical preferment; you must view him with an honest and lively gratification entering upon the honours and engaging in the duties of this new and distinguished station: view him eagerly turning the whole force of his mind and talents to the prosecution of those studies which peculiarly belong to that most important of all earthly trusts: and then view him in the midst of the most valuable researches for the farther improvement of sacred learning, in the meridian of life, in the full blown vigour of his faculties, in the unenvied possession of friends, affluence, reputation—every thing, in short, which could make his life a blessing to himself and a benefit to others,—borne down into the grave, under the pressure of the most lingering and afflictive malady:—under the pressure of a malady which commenced its silent growth with the era of his promotion; which allowed him to count the days of his elevation but by days of pain, whilst it could not prevent his fortitude and zeal from employing them as days of the most laborious and profitable study.

Have not these examples brought home to your feelings the vanity of all human enjoyments? An event, which has so recently occurred, that even the youngest has not yet had time to dismiss it from his recollection, summons your attention to another; to that of a person whose station was yet more exalted, whose celebrity was yet more extended, and who, like those whom we have already noticed, possesses a claim to our most serious remembrance; not only as supplying, like them, impressive confirmation to the truth, which is the subject of this discourse, but as having, like them too, been closely connected with the interests of this University; and having, like them, contributed not a little to its welfare and reputation.

From these considerations, and from the respect due to the memory of a man whose endowments were not less eminent than his station, allow me to offer a few observations on the more remarkable circumstances of his life.

Having been engaged in scenes of peculiar agitation and difficulty: having, from the energies of his mind, and the duties of his situation, been led to take an active part in events which involved deep interest, and excited much resentment: having been uniformly connected with the party of administration, during a period in which the governing power (from whatever cause) was occupied in the warmest contests, and resisted by the most vehement opposition: it should not excite surprise, if either his character should have taken some tincture from the acrimonious politics of the times, or if the exasperation of party should have affixed to it qualities which were either against or beyond the truth.

Details of political conduct are not the proper subjects for this place: and perhaps, in all cases, the actions and motives of political men should be viewed from a distance, to reduce them, from the exaggerated standard of party feeling, to their true and natural dimensions. This much suffice it to say, that having once chosen the line of his public exertions, his conduct was uniformly firm, manly, and consistent. Equally insensible to the acclamations and the menaces of popular zeal, he pursued undaunted his onward course; and it is not impossible, that an indignation conceived against the gross and often mischievous sacrifices to popularity, which in his political experience he must have too frequently witnessed, might have thrown the bias to the contrary side, and confirmed in him an indifference to popular opinion.

That unshaken firmness which marked his character, and directed his steps through life, was discernible on particular occasions, in proportion as they brought with them the difficulty, or the danger, that called forth its display. Of these occasions, two may be sufficient to notice; one of them endangering his political, and the other his personal existence.

On the former, we behold him risking station, emolument, and power, in the cause of loyal attachment to his sovereign, and in the maintenance of his rights; at a time, when the hopeless recovery of the monarch could leave no expectation of recompense; at a time, when wily calculation repu-

diated the side of the crown as a sinking cause; and when, in his most sanguine speculations, he could have looked to no other issue than that, which must have dismissed him from political confidence.

On the other occasion to which I allude, we behold him exposing himself to still more serious hazard, in the joint defence of the king and the constitution against the furious onset of rebellion. We all may remember, that when treason wore the air of triumph, and the friends of loyalty and order hung their heads, he stood prominent and erect: when many, even of those whose fidelity was unimpeached, seemed to feel, that prudence required of them a more softened accent of reprobation, and reserving their tones of boldness until the danger had passed by, did not scruple to shrink from an open avowal of their sentiments; when many, even of unquestioned fortitude, deemed it not inconsistent with that fortitude, to seek a momentary shelter from the storm: when treason and loyalty hung trembling in doubtful scales, and not a few paused to see which would preponderate: when it appeared to many, not unlikely, that rebellion might through success change its title to revolution:—in times and under circumstances such as these, whilst he was known to be the object eminently selected for vengeance by the ferocity of an ensanguined rabble, he remained firm and unmoved: he stepped not, for a moment, from the post of duty and of danger; and sought no safety from the perils which assailed him, save what might arise from presenting to them a bold and manly front.

If from his political we pass to his judicial conduct, we shall find the firmness of the former equalled by the decision, the promptness, and the rectitude, of the latter. Here indeed is the high ground of this distinguished character. Uniting an ardent love of justice with a rapid intuition of truth, he combined in himself the two great qualities of the judicial station, integrity and despatch: and thus, as far as lies in the power of man, he diminished the evils of litigation, by taking from law all its delay, and much of its uncertainty.

Neither did the labours of his exalted station terminate with himself. His comprehensive view embraced the whole circle of the profession: and it was not more his study, to discharge his own immediate duties with fidelity, than to enforce on others the due observance of theirs. To purify the courts of justice, was with him an object of unremitting attention: and amongst the unprincipled part of the lower order of legal practitioners, it will not easily be forgotten, with what unwearied vigilance he detected, and punished, every attempt to defeat the claims of equity by the technical dexterities of a fraudulent chicane.

Nor were the salutary effects of his superintending care confined to the subordinate ranks of the profession. To the honest exercise of that authority, which the eminence of his station and services must have secured to his official representations, we may, in no small degree, attribute that chasteness of selection, which is allowed for many years to have guided the judicial appointments. The disinterested friend of real talents and true legal knowledge, to the zeal and moment of his recommendations is the public in a great measure indebted, for the many splendid ornaments of which the judicial bench of this country can boast: for it may safely be pronounced, that, in a majority of instances at least, the wisdom of the government took the direction of its choice from the opinions and views of him, whom all knew to be so well qualified to discern, and so warmly interested to promote, what was most conducive to the respectability of the bar and the interests of justice.

An enemy to pretenders of all descriptions; to those, who by indirect means would intercept the rewards of professional ability and worth; he must naturally have left behind him not a few, who will labour to traduce his character and vilify his motives. But from all that is liberal, judicious, and respectable in the profession; from all, who know how to appreciate the value of an upright and able dispensation of justice in the land; from the general voice of the nation, which may have long indeed to wait for a successor possessed of

similar endowments; the most honourable and lasting testimony will be borne, not more to his excellencies as a judge, than to his beneficial exertions as superintendent of the whole department of the law.

On remaining particulars I must not too long detain your attention. As to his private life, it is well known, that the same steadiness, which sustained his public conduct, governed his personal attachments. His friendships were sincere, and fixed:—and although in a character marked by such strength of features, the lineaments of the softer virtues could scarcely be expected to mix, yet they who knew him in the unbendings of his retirement, have often witnessed the genuine indication of their existence, and can fully attest the spontaneous and animated emotions of a latent tenderness, which it seemed as much his study carefully to conceal, as, in this age of affected sensibility, it is that of others to display. In this, indeed, as in other parts of his character, it is to be lamented, that an habitual disgust against all hypocritical appearances had so far wrought upon his mind, as to render him generally anxious to suppress, lest he might be supposed to affect, feelings and qualities, the most honourable and endearing. The occasions, however, have not been few, in which, even to the public eye, the milder affections of his nature have broken through this restraint. And, if the charities of domestic life be received as evidence of the kindly dispositions of the heart, perhaps in no case can such proof be adduced, more abundant and convincing.

In all matters of pecuniary concern his dealings were directed by a strict and punctual regard to his engagements; and, at the same time, distinguished by a liberality, which, without indulging in those excesses that beget embarrassment and sacrifice independence, manifestly evinced a mind aloof from the sordid love of accumulation. In him, indeed, honesty and liberality can scarcely be said to have claimed the rank of virtues. They required no effort, and could boast no triumph, where a rooted contempt of wealth precluded all means of their counteraction. And it deserves to be re-

marked, that amongst the numerous calumnies which a vindictive malice has endeavoured to cast upon the fame of this distinguished person, the tongue of slander has never whispered the imputation of a single act of mercenary meanness.

With the quality here noticed was connected another, in which, as in the former, it were happy if the gentry of our country regarded him as the model of their imitation; I mean his generosity as a landlord; which, whilst it led him to look with an indulgent lenity on the deficiencies of the industrious tenant, secured to the ancient occupier of the soil, the renewed possession of his little patrimony, undisturbed by any apprehension from those necessities, or that avidity, which too often impel our landholders to sacrifice, to the prospect of gain, the claims, the comforts, and the independence of the peasant; by surrendering him to the rapacity of a class of men, who, used to view the cultivator like the clod he tills, but as a subject of profitable traffic, have, by their unfeeling extortions, constituted one of the most perniciously operating causes of the wretchedness, the ignorance, and the degradation, of the lower order of our people.

I turn now to the consideration of those points in which *we* must feel a more immediate concern. His unvarying attachment to the interests of the established religion of these countries should not be forgotten in this place. Founded for the express purpose of teaching and propagating that religion, which we believe to be the religion of the gospel, we must naturally retain a grateful remembrance of those strenuous exertions, which at all times he opposed to the designs of those, who laboured to erect upon the ruins of our Protestant establishment, the gloomy fabric of an erroneous, an exclusive, and an intolerant superstition. We must naturally retain a grateful remembrance of his services, when we consider, that at the moment when a strange spirit of innovation (combined, as it must have been, with an indifference to religious truth) had so far perverted the judgment of some who held the helm of the state, as to induce them to hazard a mad experiment upon the establishment of the empire, he, boldly,

in the face of power, and in contempt of influence, resisted the attempt; and, by the manliness of his efforts, co-operating with the beneficent views of the father of his people, contributed to defeat the rash design.

But it is not through the medium of the establishment alone, that *we* find an interest in the retrospect of his exertions. Educated in this seminary, he here laid the foundation of those intellectual improvements, and exhibited the first specimen of those talents, and that perseverance, which afterwards advanced him to the highest offices in the state. His early intercourse with this society, and the honours by which his academic labours had been so richly crowned, conspiring with his professional endeavours in behalf of its political independence, naturally led to his connexion with the university, in the quality of representative: and to this, after an interval of some years, succeeded a connexion of another and a higher kind, by which the supreme superintendence of the institution was vested in his hands.

In this last relation, which continued whilst he lived, the benefits which this place has experienced have been important, and should be gratefully acknowledged. To him we owe that liberal and just decision, which, by restoring to the governing part of this body its due deliberative weight, has for ever secured the interests of education from the blighting influence of a despotic will. To his vigilance we owe the preservation of this place from the unnatural conspiracy which the frenzy of the times had raised up, even within these walls: and to his regard for the reputation of our seminary we are indebted for the honourable testimony which, on so many public occasions, he willingly bestowed on the general loyalty of our youth. To him also we are indebted for another benefit, perhaps not inferior to any that has been noticed: for that active and zealous interference, which, by disappointing the hopes and disconcerting the intrigues of insufficient pretenders, was, on an occasion not far distant, so happily instrumental in preventing the recurrence of that system of political influence, which, by disturbing the ap-

pointment to the presidency of this Society from the just ground of academic claims, has already at certain times injured, and whenever resorted to, must injure most essentially, the well being of the institution.

Such were some of the merits and some of the actions of this eminently endowed personage, who is now no more. If there were faults in the character, which, in the opinion of some, cast a shade on its many shining qualities, this is but the lot of man. To detect faults is more easy and less profitable than to emulate virtues: and in a life so active and so conspicuous, it were strange if there were not many things to provoke resentment, and some to incur censure. If, however, there were faults, these are not for us to canvass. They are now before that Judge, in whose presence the greatest must stand, and to whom he must render a solemn account of all his actions.

This awful consideration leads me unavoidably to the mention of one particular more in the history of the deceased, which is too important to be omitted on the present occasion: I mean, that seriousness of religious impression; that feeling of accountableness to a supreme tribunal, so unequivocally manifested in the interesting and emphatic language in which he has spoken (in his last melancholy document) of the mercies and the chastenings of his God. There is too often reason to lament that such impressions have been weakened, if not effaced, by the distracting agitations of political collision; and by the habits of a profession, whose object is, for the most part, rather the exercise of a gainful ingenuity than the scientific acquisition of truth. That the combination of these causes, although operating in the present instance with peculiar force, yet failed to produce on his mind this unhappy effect, will be best proved by the recital of the words, in which he has himself expressed his religious sentiments—"I earnestly entreat for pardon of my sins from the mercy of Almighty God. I am truly sensible of, and grateful for, the many blessings which, through his mercy and goodness, I have enjoyed in this world, and bow, as becomes me,

with resignation, to such afflictions as have been visited upon me; hoping through the mercy and mediation of my Redeemer, his blessed Son, for salvation in the next world."

Are these the feelings of a Christian or not? And these, it must be remembered, are not the mechanical and momentary effusions of a mind startled into an artificial piety at the nearer view of approaching dissolution; but the calm and deliberate breathings of the heart, at a time when the enjoyment of unimpaired health, and unabated vigour, might be supposed to preclude all apprehensions of death; and when the full possession of wealth, power, and every other object of worldly pursuit, might be supposed not less to preclude every cause of dissatisfaction with life. Perhaps there was no one period at which he had apparently better reason to expect, or stronger inducements to desire, a continuance of life, than that very period at which he seems to have been thus anxious to *set his house in order*, in preparation for death.

But the high value he set upon the belief and the hopes of a Christian, may be inferred yet farther, from the anxious solicitude with which he entreats, that the same sources of consolation, and the same springs of virtuous action, which he describes as having ministered so effectually to his support and direction, should be secured for the guidance of those for whose happiness he felt in common with his own. After much excellent advice respecting the education and conduct of his children, he concludes with expressing his most earnest desire that the utmost care should be taken, "to instil into their minds, from their earliest years, the principles of morality, and the Christian religion; and above all other the precepts of the same, a love of truth and justice, which" (he adds) "they will find the best inheritance that I can transmit to them."

Here, my young brethren, is a most invaluable lesson; invaluable no less to you than to those for whom it was immediately intended. Here is an instance of a man, who, like him that has pronounced all to be *vanity*, had known

and enjoyed whatever good things this life can bestow; and, like him, has solemnly affirmed, that in such things happiness cannot consist. Here is an instance of a man, who, whilst surrounded by all that the world calls prosperous, yet openly announces that the only anchor on which he can place a sure reliance, is the mercy of his God, and the merits of his Redeemer; and who bequeaths to his children, as an inheritance infinitely surpassing all the wealth or honours he could transfer, the principles of a Christian faith and practice:—thus seeming to sum up the whole of his experience and instructions, in language similar to that of the wise man before referred to: *My son, be admonished—Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every secret work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.*

Study this lesson, my young brethren. *Remember*, I beseech you, *your Creator in the days of your youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when ye shall say, I have no pleasure in them:* before the time come, when *the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit unto God who gave it.* Remember, that in those days, nothing but the retrospect of a Christian life, and the hope of a Christian reward, can yield you comfort. Be assured, that in these you will have abundant consolation. Be assured, that with these, and with these alone, as your *rod and staff*, you may safely *walk through the valley of the shadow of death, and fear no evil.* Let these momentous reflections sink deep into your hearts. To these reflections I have wished to lead your minds, by the notice of those distinguished characters, whose peculiar connexion with our own situation might draw us to a nearer interest in their fate. You have seen what is the final period of all human schemes and undertakings: you cannot but feel, then, the vanity of all that terminates in the present state. You have seen the ardent hopes of youth, the matured wisdom of age, the attainments of learning, and the acquisitions of power, all swept indiscriminately into the grave. You have seen how

awful is the government of God; how easily human greatness bends before him; and how quickly all our designs and measures, at his interposal, vanish into nothing: you have seen, also, and know, that youth and strength can furnish no shield against the Almighty. Are you not then convinced, that each individual should apply to himself the warning of the prophet: *Set thine house in order: for thou shalt die, and not live.* May God bestow on each of us the grace to make this application, and to make it in such manner, that we may profit by it unto salvation!

NOTES.

PAGE 380.—In this, and the two preceding pages, a similarity of subject leading to a similarity of reflection,—I have not scrupled to adopt, in two or three instances, the language of a writer from whom no person, treating the same topics, need be ashamed to receive assistance. The felicities of Doctor Johnson's style are such, that having once laid hold of the memory, they will not easily yield their place to other forms of expression; and he, who is more desirous of utility than of novelty, will not be very anxious to dislodge them.

P. 382, line 4, from the bottom,—"Parental guardian of this seminary."

The Rev. Richard Murray, D.D., late Provost of Trinity College, who died in the month of June, 1799: and whose life and character have been sketched with equal truth and eloquence, by the Rev. Doctor Graves, in a funeral sermon preached and published by that gentleman.

P. 384, line 18, from the bottom,—"Laborious and profitable study."

The Right Rev. Dr. Matthew Young, late Bishop of Clonfert, and formerly a senior fellow of Trinity College, who died November 28, 1800, is the subject of this paragraph. In an appendix to the discourse, delivered, at the interment of the Bishop, by Doctor Elrington, the able successor of his lordship in the Philosophical chair of Dublin College, the following interesting, though afflictive, account is given, of the rise and progress of this fatal disease, and of the literary labours, so perseveringly prosecuted under its agonizing pressure.

"His consecration took place on the third of February, 1799, and nearly at the same moment, the dreadful malady, which terminated so fatally, made its appearance. At first only a small ulcer on the tongue, it occasioned little alarm: but the duty to which he was called, at the primary visitation of his diocese, of giving a public exhortation to his Clergy, produced such an aggravation of the complaint as gave serious cause for apprehension. Its horrid progress was thenceforward continual. His utterance became painful, and gradually inarticulate. The disorder spread to the throat. To the dreadful pain attendant on cancer was added the torture arising from the application of the violent remedies which were judged necessary. Hopeless of relief from regular practitioners, he went to seek it at Whitworth in Lancashire; and there, after near five months of extreme suffering, he expired on the 28th of November, in the fiftieth year of his age.

"It will hardly be credited, that during the rapid progress of this deplorable malady, he drew up from his Lectures his Analysis of the Principles of Natural Philosophy, and superintended the publication with an accuracy and correctness scarcely to be equalled—laboured in the improvement of his comment on the first book of Newton's Principia—wrote an Essay on Sophisms, collecting examples of the various

species from the Deistical writers, and thus serving at once the cause of Science and of Religion—made himself acquainted with the Syriac language; and completed a translation of the Psalms, of which before his illness he had done little more than sketch out the plan:—and drew up a Demonstration *à priori* of the existence and attributes of the Deity. These last two works occupied his attention as long as he could hold a pen, and were the subject of his correspondence till within a very few weeks of his death. The axioms which he assumed as the foundation of his proof of the existence of a GOD, are discussed by him in a letter to the provost, dated the tenth of last October!"

Having been led, by the subject of this discourse, to notice particularly the characters of those respectable and lamented members of our body, named in the two last notes; I find myself irresistibly impelled, in this place, to make mention of another, whose kindred merits naturally link his memory to theirs; calling up an additional regret in the contemplation of those losses which the University has sustained in talent and virtue; and demanding a tribute from the same pen, that attempts to describe the excellencies of those, who have, at any time, advanced its fame, and promoted its usefulness.—The Rev. Digby Marsh, D.D., and senior fellow of the College, although nine years have elapsed since his decease, yet lives fresh in the memory and the affections of all who knew him: and to them it will not be unacceptable, to see enrolled, in the same pages with the names of MURRAY and YOUNG,—names with which his had been closely connected in life,—a memorial, which, however deficient it may be in all other respects, has been deemed by those, who well knew the character it represents, to possess the qualities of accuracy and truth. This memorial was the production of the period of his decease, and exhibits the following picture of that amiable and revered character.

"Whether we consider the strength of his mind, the greatness of his talents, or the number of his virtues, we cannot hesitate to pronounce him amongst the first characters of which the university, or perhaps the nation, can boast.

"Calm, deliberate, and reserved;—his calmness was fortitude;—his deliberation, wisdom;—his reserve, modesty.

"That magnanimity, which raised him above the reach of passion, gave to every action of his life, decision and intrepidity; and whilst he seemed slow in deciding, he was retarded, not by dulness of conception, but by the range of his sagacity, and the comprehension of his views.

"The austerity of his deportment,—the effect not of pride but of constitution,—was softened into affability by a native gentleness and benevolence, which could not be disguised; and through a severity of manner, perhaps not ill suited to the serious dignity of his mind, beamed the mildest effusions of a generous and feeling heart.

"His affections were not easily excited, but they were strong, steady, and permanent: and whilst he scorned to make *professions* of regard, his *actions* proved him a sincere and disinterested friend.

"Noble and elevated in his sentiments, he has left behind him a character unsullied by a single mean or dishonourable act. Nor, indeed, was it possible, that a man, the independence of whose virtue rested upon itself, and did not court, but rather shunned applause, could have deviated from the strict path which honour and conscience prescribe.

"Endowed with singular powers of understanding, he sought not their display: his genius was too proud to stoop to fame, too modest to hope for it: but the gratitude of that place, which has been enriched by his talents, and adorned by his virtues, will pay to his memory that tribute of admiration and praise, which the diffidence, that ever attends real abilities, would have prevented him from accepting in his life."

P. 385, line 5, from the botom,—" On the former."

The reader will easily perceive, that the measure of the REGENCY is that to to which reference is here made—a measure, which, in opposition to the most able and strenuous exertions of Mr. Fitzgibbon, then attorney-general, was decided by the Irish Parliament in such a manner, as to give cause of deep and lasting regret to every true friend of the country, by breaking the unity of the councils of the empire, and endangering the existing connexion of its parts.

P. 387, last line,—" To wait for a successor," &c.

Since the time at which this sermon was preached, his Majesty's choice of a successor to Lord Clare has been publicly announced; and has happily devolved upon one whose high qualifications promise to repair the loss which the judicial bench has sustained, as far as such loss can be repaired.

P. 388, line 15, from the bottom,—" Even to the public eye."

A striking instance of this appeared at the visitation held in the College, in the month of April, 1798, at which Lord Clare presided as vice-chancellor. On this occasion, notwithstanding his indignation at the horrible conspiracy which had shed its poison even into the recesses of academic seclusion, the severity of justice seemed to melt away in compassion for the errors of youthful credulity; and the affectionate suavity of paternal remonstrance, in many cases, superseded the strict sentence of judicial condemnation.

P. 390, line 12,—" So richly crowned."

Mr. Fitzgibbon's collegiate honours make a distinguished appearance on the face of our public records. Having entered the College of Dublin, as fellow commoner, in the year 1763, he appears to have prosecuted his studies with unusual diligence and success. The competition between him and the celebrated Mr. Grattan was unremitting, through the entire of their course. Being always of the same division, they were necessarily engaged in immediate contest for those academic rewards, that are bestowed on superiority of answering at the stated quarterly examinations. It is interesting to trace through the judgments, and the prizes, allotted at these several examinations, the eagerness of the struggle for pre-eminence, which at this early day commenced between two men so conspicuous, and who have since carried that struggle into the highest concerns of life. Mr. Grattan seems to have taken the lead at the commencement of the course, having won from his competitor, the premium, and certificate, in two of the examinations of the junior freshman year. But victory then changed sides, and continued with his opponent through the remainder of the contest: Mr. Fitzgibbon bearing ăway from him, in every succeeding instance, the premium or certificate; and being particularly distinguished, at the Hilary examination of 1766, by the extraordinary judgment of *Optime*, conferred on his translation of the Georgics, by the late Doctor Law.

P. 390, line 13,—" Its political independence."

The validity of the return of Mr. Richard Hely Hutchinson, (now Lord Donoughmore,) as representative of the University of Dublin, was tried before a committee of the House of Commons, in the month of February, 1777. The ability and zeal of Mr. Fitzgibbon, who acted as counsel on the part of those who were desirous to preserve the purity of college elections, were on this occasion conspicuous and triumphant. And, in the following month, he received from the University, the honourable reward of his services; being elected, in the room of Mr. Hutchinson, whose return had been annulled by the committee on the ground of undue influence in the returning officer, the right honourable John Hely Hutchinson, provost of the college.

P. 390, line 18,—"Vested in his hands."

On the resignation of the office of vice-chancellor of the university, by Primate Robinson, the Earl of Clare was appointed to that office by his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, on the 22d of June, 1791.

P. 390, line 16, from the bottom,—"Liberal and just decision."

To those who are unacquainted with the history of the College, some explanation on this head is necessary. The charter has vested in the provost and senior fellows, the government of the society, and the election of fellows. The provosts, however, had, for a series of years, assumed a *veto* in all cases, and in the election of fellows the direct power of *nomination*, even in opposition to the suffrages of all the remaining electors. This unwarrantable usurpation was not permitted long to survive the appointment of Lord Fitzgibbon to the office of Vice-chancellor. At a visitation held in the August of 1791, it was made the subject of judicial inquiry, and pronounced by the Vice-chancellor, with the concurrence of his co-visitor, the Archbishop of Dublin, to have been a gross violation of the charter. And by this means, a final stop was put to abuses, corruptions, and oppressions, of which none, who had not a melancholy experience of those times, can form any conception.

It is but justice, however, to the memory of Dr. Young, to state, that by him was the legality of those extraordinary claims first brought regularly into discussion: and that an argument on this subject, which would have done honour to the ablest and best informed legal understanding, had been drawn up and published by him in the year 1790.

P. 390, line 3, from the bottom,—"On an occasion not far distant."

It is well known, that on the last vacancy of the provostship, caused by the death of Doctor Murray, political intrigue was, as usual, busily employed, to supplant the regular academic claimant. It is well known also, that whatever weight the opinion of the vice-chancellor could have with government, was exerted in counteraction of that intrigue: and, happily for the College, it was exerted with success:—happily, indeed, in all respects: not only as rescuing it from the gripe of those, who might have called back those unhappy days in which science had drooped, and the academic muse had mourned; but as placing it in the hands of a man truly competent to the arduous station; a man, equally recommended by his academic merits, and by the confidence and respect of those he was to govern:—under the tempered discipline of whose parental guidance, the members of the society enjoy all that tranquillity, and all that encouragement, which are so requisite to the successful cultivation of science, and which have already been productive of the happiest effects.

P. 392, line 8,—"At a time when," &c.

The Chancellor's will bears date from the month of December, 1800.

N.B. This discourse, as it is now given to the public, differs, in a few passages near the conclusion, from the sermon as it was preached. Having been prepared on very short notice, it must naturally have required some correction: and one topic, particularly, I have omitted, as I have since discovered, that the observations relating to it were founded on inaccurate information.

Raffaelle Sanzio dipinse. *Raffaelle Morghen dis.e incise 1832.*

SALUS NOSTRA IN MANU TUA *Gen. 47.*

Firenze presso Niccolò Pagni Fig.i e Comp.a

A

CHARGE,

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF RAPHOE,

AT THE

PRIMARY VISITATION OF THAT DIOCESE,

IN

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. EUNAN,

ON WEDNESDAY, 17TH OF OCTOBER, 1821.

A

CHARGE,

ETC., ETC.

On this first occasion of my meeting you assembled, my reverend brethren, by the summons of your Diocesan, it is requisite that I should address myself to you on matters which concern us both deeply; and which not only concern *us*, but are vitally connected with the best interests of those who are intrusted to our joint spiritual superintendence.

During the first year of my connexion with this See, I did not deem myself qualified to enter with you, effectively, upon the details, which the circumstances of the diocese might require: and, therefore, within that interval I did not offer to you any communication from this place.

It fortunately happened, that the triennal Visitation of the Metropolitan rendered the form of such a procedure less necessary. And I conceived, that I could not employ the early period of my residence amongst you to greater advantage, than by taking a regular circuit of the several parishes of the diocese; and thereby acquainting myself, by personal inspection, not only with the condition of the churches, glebes, and glebe-houses, throughout the whole, but also in a great measure with the habits, and characters, and localities, as well of the general mass of the population, as of the clergy themselves.

By this domestic species of visitation, I was enabled the better to discover the respective wants of the different parishes

seems to the unreflecting, as wanting that which could give it meaning and efficacy, the consciousness and consent of its subject, in the contract which it embraces: so that by those, who do not discern its true scriptural character as a sacramental engagement, (which is unhappily the case with a large proportion of the community,) it is but too generally viewed either as a *charm*, or as a *ceremony*. Now, confirmation tends to remedy this deficiency. It may be conceived as the consummation of Baptism. It gives to that rite, in common view, significancy and substance. And, what before appeared as the gratuitous adoption of the unconscious infant into the visible church of Christ, becomes now the voluntary acceptance of the Christian's covenant, and the spiritual initiation of the intelligent and instructed. So that, with those who cannot comprehend the value of infant baptism, it may be considered, with a certain latitude, as the baptism of the adult.

Again, as confirmation is prescribed by the church, as the legitimate introduction of the young Christian to the holy communion, it presents itself as an intelligible and connecting medium between our two great sacraments. It renews and confirms the covenant entered into by the one; and it makes the due preparation to seal and sanctify that covenant by the other. So that, in truth, the practice of this rite may be made the occasion of spreading through your entire parishes, in a way the best calculated to excite interest and attention, the whole scheme of a Christian's belief and duty.

You have witnessed for yourselves, my reverend brethren, the great eagerness which was manifested for the instructions given, and the tracts circulated, previous to the late confirmations; and you can say, whether that occasion did not furnish *you* with opportunities of more extensive and edifying teaching to your flock than you have usually enjoyed; and whether it did not afford to *them* incentives, and inspire them with a zeal, to learn and profit from your teaching, which have not been manifested at other times. In truth,

nothing could tend more to stir up a spirit of religious improvement amongst the people, nothing could bring the clergy into more profitable contact with their parishioners, nothing could present them more in the light of true pastors looking to the welfare of their flocks, than a system, which exhibited the whole clergy of the diocese, in all its ranks from the highest to the lowest, in active exertion, seeking everywhere after the young and uninstructed, visiting every cottage, soliciting every parent, encouraging and instructing every child, to draw them to the knowledge and the practice of religion, and to guide their feet into that path, which, if through the divine grace they continue in it, will lead them to everlasting happiness. Such a system must necessarily have spread through your several parishes, gratification no less than improvement; and even those, who will not accept of your ministry, and who dissent from your doctrines, cannot but see and feel the advantages resulting from it, and must at least be warmed towards a church, which prescribes such practices, even though they be not led to conform to its institutions.

I have mentioned, that, in the course of my circuit, I discovered some irregularities in the mode of administering divine service. In some instances I observed parts of the Liturgy disturbed from their due order; in some, certain prayers were omitted; in some, they were altered; and upon the whole, liberties were taken not unfrequently with the directions of the Rubric; as if the performance of the service were left to the discretion of the individual minister, or as if some of the matters prescribed were of such trifling import, as to render it a thing of indifference whether they were conformed to or not. But, it is to be remarked, that in the case of a *rule*, no departure is of trifling import. The very essence of a rule requires exactness, and its principle demands obedience. To depart from a rule, is to relinquish its principle; and if once its principle be given up, there is no limit to departure: all will then depend upon the judgment, or the humour, of the individual. And here, in truth,

lies the great difference between the Churchman and the Sectarian. The one submits himself to the rules of the church; the other obeys the dictates of his private opinion.

But the clergy of the Established Church have yet further to reflect, that they are, in all departures from the prescribed forms of the church service, not only exchanging the principle of church discipline for the laxity of sectarian caprice; but that they are also, at one and the same time, violating a trust, offending against the law of the land, and breaking through their own most solemn engagements. They violate a trust; for the powers and privileges with which the church has invested them, were bestowed to enable them to preserve its discipline unimpaired, and to transmit its constitution pure and uncorrupt to those who are to succeed them in the like station. They offend against the law of the land; for the Act of Uniformity enjoins on them an undeviating adherence to all the forms of the Rubric. And, they break through their own most solemn engagements; for on their admission into holy orders, as well as on their appointment to their several cures, they have bound themselves repeatedly, by their deliberate and recorded declarations, to an exact conformity to the Book of Common Prayer.

It will readily be perceived, that these observations apply, not merely to variations in the prayers and forms of the usual service of the church, but that they equally extend to all departures from the known and established discipline in its several offices. Amongst these, none is more strongly to be condemned, than the practice of administering baptism in private houses. The laws of the church admit no such practice. The clergyman has no *right* to adopt it. An exception is, indeed, specially made for the case, where life may be endangered; but even there, the full completion of the rite is reserved for the open celebration of the church. In no other way can the sanctity and religious character of this solemn ordinance be preserved. It should be remembered, that this is the solemn dedication of the child to Christ; the admission of an immortal soul to the privileges of the Chris-

tian covenant; the first great sacrament which lifts the fallen offspring of the common parent out of the state of nature, and places it in a state of grace. Can it then be necessary, to enforce the propriety of confining an observance of such sacred import to the place, which is consecrated to sacred uses? And that which the reason of the thing so manifestly prescribes, the authority of the law commands. No clergyman, therefore, of the Established Church, can conscientiously release himself from the obligation of the Rubric in the performance of this office.

I shall not dwell at present on the particulars enjoined in the performance of the other offices, and on the necessity of observing them. The Rubric sufficiently details them: the law of the land, and the canons of the church, sufficiently enforce them: and to some of the more important, I have already called your more immediate attention, in the circular letters, which I have from time to time addressed to you through the vicar general and the registrar of the diocese, as well as in my personal communications with you individually in the circuit of the visitation.

But, here, I cannot refrain from adverting to an apology sometimes made, on the part of the parochial clergy, for omissions and irregularities, on the points to which I have alluded: namely, their want of knowledge of what the rules of Ecclesiastical Law demand. Now, not to mention, that the most important part of these rules is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, which is appointed for the service of the church; and that this, through the Rubric, the canons, and the Act of Uniformity, (all of which it contains,) presents a summary of Ecclesiastical Law, that leaves the ordinary parochial clergyman little to seek for from other sources; there are, besides, cheap compendiums of easy access, with which every clergyman should provide himself, if he be really anxious to know and do his duty. In any other profession, it would be deemed an unpardonable excuse for the violation or neglect of the rules of that profession, that the individual had not taken pains to learn what

they were. What then is to be said of such an excuse, in the case of a profession, whose members are persons of education; bound to the discharge of most serious and important duties, deeply affecting the welfare of society at large, essentially connected with the existence of the establishment to which they belong, indispensable to the due execution of the trust which has been reposed in them, and standing on the solemn obligations of their ordination voluntarily incurred!

Again, should it be alleged, that, in a district abounding with dissenters from the established religion, it is expedient, in point of policy, to relax somewhat of the rigour of its rules, and to assimilate as far as can reasonably be done with those who differ from our forms, and whose objections to our church are often derived more from its discipline than its doctrines: it should, in the first place, be remembered, as before, that the parish minister has no right, no liberty is left to him, to make any such relaxation: and, in the next place, he is mistaken in the supposition, that good policy dictates such a procedure. He may, indeed, thereby lower the church to the dissenter: but he will not bring the dissenter to the church. On the contrary, if the dissenter is made to feel, that the churchman attaches no importance to the forms, why should he adopt a system which upholds them? Why should even the churchman himself continue to regard them, since they no longer stand upon the ground of duty; or why should he conceive any real difference to exist between the church and the conventicle, unless what may arise from the difference of doctrine?

Thus, the principle of sectarianism is established, by the very means erroneously employed for its counteraction. No: the cause of sound policy coincides both with the truth of the case, and with the plain duty of the clergyman. The established forms of the church must be maintained; and maintained with even the greater exactness, the more the principle of dissent prevails around us. If the sectarian labours to efface the notions of a *church*, and of a *priesthood*,

he only points out to us the necessity of our carefully maintaining the essential characters of both. If he directs his endeavours to the levelling those distinctions, and the undermining those institutions, which form the line of demarcation between him and the followers of an apostolic standard; he only marks more strongly the importance of defending that boundary, which the ancient laws of the church have formed for its preservation.

You will not, I trust, my reverend brethren, whilst I thus earnestly urge the necessity of supporting established forms, impute to me an overstrained attachment to forms, merely as such. No: the forms, which the laws of our church prescribe, are all connected with essentials: they are connected with feelings, that sustain the sanctity of religion, and the reverence due to its ministers. The profession, in which we are embarked, is (it must be allowed by all) one of a grave and solemn character, one proposing for its object the salvation of immortal souls. Surely, the rules and forms of such a profession should all bear the impress of its momentous object; and none, which do bear that impress, should be lightly thought of. How then can *we* undervalue those rules, and encourage others to treat them as matters of indifference?

It should be remembered, that the true ground of our respectability in human estimation, is to be found in the serious consistency, with which we are seen to pursue the objects of our calling: and, that, even amongst the world at large, those who are but too apt to slight their own duty, are still ready to bestow full condemnation and contempt upon the clergyman, who openly disregards his. The minister of the Established Church, then, who departs from the rules of his order, is not likely to obtain respect, even from those who might be supposed the most lenient and interested judges of his conduct

The clergyman, who is faithful in his office, has little cause to fear the charge of too great precision in the exact observance of rules. If he shews, that he labours in all cases after

what is essential, he will prove, that it is not by the love of form he is influenced; he will prove, that he deems the form itself to be essential; and even those, who may differ from him in that judgment, cannot but respect the principle and venerate the man. Let him be diligent and zealous in discharging the various duties of a parish minister, not only in the serious and earnest administration of the services of the church, but in the offices of visiting, of catechizing, of instructing both the young and old of his parishioners, who need and will receive his instructions; not contenting himself with being found at his post, when called upon for the occasional exercise of his functions, but forward to seek out and to discover every case in which his ministry can be employed with effect; stirring up the spirit of religion amongst his flock; calling them to the house of God; expostulating affectionately with those who are not sufficiently attentive to that call; and especially availing himself of the great festivals, to excite them to increased seriousness of life, and to frequent and enlivened preparation for the holy sacrament. Let this consistent course be pursued; and the clergyman, who is thus seen to labour after the true and substantial ends of godliness, will never be suspected of laying a stress on forms beyond what he deems to be essential to effect these ends.

But, again, it is not merely with respect to the professional offices, that the clergy should be tenacious of the forms prescribed to them, but with respect to their professional habits, at large, they should be equally careful to maintain them. The clergy are a body of men set apart from society for sacred purposes, and it ill becomes them to be desirous to reject those forms and habits of life, which not only the laws of the church, and the vows which they have taken, imperatively impose, but which the common feelings of mankind sanction and exact. We can never, surely, forget the solemn vows of our ordination service, that we would "apply all our diligence to frame and fashion our own lives and the lives of our families, according to the doctrine of Christ; and to

make both ourselves and them, as much as in us lieth, wholesome examples of the flock of Christ." This, it is clear, marks us out, as bound by the most sacred engagements, to a course of life different from that which is unhappily too prevalent in the world at large: it marks us out, not as persons who may freely conform to all the fashions which surround us, but as persons who are to place before the eyes of society "*wholesome examples*."

Are the clergy, then, to be afraid of the charge of *singularity*, if they do not break through their solemn vows, and mix themselves in the secular pursuits, and the relaxed manners and habits of those, who have not incurred the like obligations? Are they, who are set up, as lights upon a hill; who are appointed to be the models and exemplars of the many; are they to descend from that high and truly dignified station, and to submit to be the followers of that multitude, whom it is their business to direct; nay more, of whom great numbers at all times look to them for direction? They may depend upon it, if they act so, that they are not only acting in violation of their vows, and in defeasance of their usefulness, but that they are flinging from them that very respect and estimation, which they are making these sacrifices to obtain.

It is manifest, I do not here speak of a conformity in what is decidedly profligate or immoral: that belongs to a higher order of criminality, about which no one can be mistaken, and which is sure to be visited with universal condemnation. But I speak of that conformity, which (unfortunately) too many of our order deem not inconsistent with their profession; a conformity, in amusements, in manners, in occupations; a conformity, in short, which tends to blend and confound the clerical order with the other classes of society, so that every distinguishing character of a minister of the gospel is made to vanish from the view, the parish priest becomes lost in the country gentleman, and the spiritual guide superseded by the sociable companion. No: as in every profession there is a certain demeanour which befits it; so is there

eminently in ours. And that departure from such demeanour, which, in other professions would be unseemly, in ours becomes not less than criminal. It belongs to all, to abstain from evil; but it is bound upon us, to abstain from *all appearance of evil.* Levity suits not the calling of a Christian minister. Secular occupations are not its true employment. His office is a grave one. And his manners and habits should not disgrace it.

Let it not be supposed, that, whilst guarding the clergy against the faults to which I advert, I would recommend it to them to become monastic, or morose; or, that I would deny to the clergyman, amusement and relaxation. On the contrary, without both, scarcely any man is long equal to the vigorous discharge of duty: and for their moderate and proper use no clergyman is to be condemned. But, the amusement of the worldly part of society is too often the toil of dissipation; and, what is called relaxation by many, is for the most part (to say the least of it) an unpardonable waste of time. Pleasure is but too much the eager pursuit of the crowd. And are the clergy to be seen giving encouragement to the thoughtless in such a pursuit; and to be found in habits of association with those who professedly make this the object of their lives? No: the time was, when the sober discipline of the church imposed upon the clerical order even a distinction of garb, which tended to separate them from the irregularities of secular life. And, I trust, the time will never cease to be, in which the still higher discipline of conscience will operate to preserve that distinction of manners and of conduct, which shall keep at least the worthy part of the order, from all those intercourses with society, which war with general sanctity of life, or with the particular designs of their institution.

In the present state of the world, the clergy, in their several ranks, are to mix undoubtedly with the several classes of society. But still they are to mix, *as* clergy. They are never to forget their sacred and peculiar character. They

are, as far as possible, to restrain and regulate. They are not to follow, but to influence. It is their bounden duty to conciliate, as far as honestly can be done; and, for this purpose, they must take care, not to make religion appear unamiable and repulsive in the eyes of the world. At the same time, they must take equal care, not to sacrifice the end to the means; nor, whilst they endeavour to make religion agreeable, ever to seek approbation or good will at the expense of the smallest of *its* interests.

But, it is not through pleasurable pursuits only, but through those of business also, that the clergy may be drawn away from their proper duties, and lose their distinctive character. Those exertions of industry, which, in other situations of life, would be highly praiseworthy, may be, in that of a minister of the gospel, deserving of condemnation. We have already touched upon some of the chief occupations of a parish minister; and, not to insist here on the loss of station and of respect which must attend his engaging in any of the modes of worldly traffic, it is manifest, from what has been said, that no leisure can be left to him for such employments. To do justice to his spiritual trust, must furnish a full demand upon all, of time, of ability, and of attention, that he can bestow. And, therefore, whatever of these he expends on worldly business, he withholds from that higher business, which he has engaged himself to discharge, to the exclusion of every other. It is not possible for him to serve both God and Mammon. And therefore it is, that, in the engagements which a minister is called upon to make, at the time of his admission to the sacred office, he is required to forsake and set aside (as much as lieth in him) all worldly cares, and to give himself wholly to the one office, to which it had pleased God to call him.

There may, undoubtedly, be cases, in which the wants of a family may press so upon the scanty provision of some of our poorer brethren, as to supply the plea of necessity for resorting to unprofessional modes of support. It is much to be lamented that such cases should exist; and that any of

those, who are appointed to preach the gospel, should not be furnished with the decent means of living by it. This, however, can yield no shadow of excuse to the many, who, without such necessity, turn to their farm or their merchandize, though invited and engaged to better things. And, indeed, in almost every case, it is well worth considering, whether the desire of conforming to the standard of living set up by the world, instead of that which befits the Clerical Order, be not the true cause of that necessity, which is complained of. But, at all events, if there be some extreme cases, of the nature to which we have adverted, these can in no degree affect the general principle,—that the minister of the gospel is to devote himself to the great spiritual work which he has undertaken; and that all, that it is in his power to bring forward, for the furtherance of that work, it is his bounden and irreversible duty to employ.

But, does the clergyman still find some portion of his time undisposed of, even after the due attention to those pastoral duties which have been particularly noticed? There yet remains another duty to be spoken of, for which, all the time that he can possibly command, will prove not more than enough. I mean that study of his profession, which is requisite to enable him duly to inform *himself*, and rightly and powerfully to instruct his *flock*, in the things which belong to their everlasting welfare. Here, there is an ample and still uncontracted field for his exertions. When well considered, there is, perhaps, no profession, that demands more close and persevering study, than that of a minister of the gospel. And therefore it is, that the wisdom of our church has required, that, in preparation for the sacred office, a foundation should be laid in a lengthened course of instruction in the various parts of human learning; and has deemed it right not to intrust the sacred deposit of the Gospel to those who had not by their early habits familiarized their minds to study, and stored their understandings with the acquisitions of knowledge.

Some, indeed, have affected to decry the use of learning

for a minister of the gospel; and those especially have done so, who are destitute, and, consequently, ignorant of its advantages. But, a sounder judgment has established its utility: and, the various demands upon the knowledge and the talent of the Christian minister, in the diversified exercises of his duty, prove, that he cannot possess too much of either for the important service in which he is engaged. No doubt, the knowledge in which, above all, he is to abound, is the knowledge of sacred things. But learning, and the habits of close and just thinking connected with it, render this, like all other knowledge, more accurate, and sound, and comprehensive. And, the very circumstance of the treasures of Revelation being conveyed to us through the languages of antiquity, imposes it as a duty upon the authorized expounder of that Revelation, to acquire a critical and familiar acquaintance with those languages; as well to transmit to the unlearned the full force and value of the original truth, as to guard its purity against the corruptions, which either presumptuous ignorance, or perverse heresy, would engraft upon the sacred word.

At this day especially, when the genuine contents of Scripture are endangered by the circulation of new versions of that holy book, professing to open the eyes of the world upon the multiplied errors of our received translation; and when, with the most imposing pretensions, the various sects (especially the Socinian, the most presumptuous and the least informed of all sects) are obtruding upon the various classes of society, their false transcripts of the word of God, for his pure revelation; it surely is not unreasonable to expect from him, who is the appointed guardian of the great record of the Christian faith and hope, to be qualified to distinguish the counterfeit from the true, and to protect those intrusted to his pastoral care, against such insidious machinations of ungodly zeal.

The Clergy, in the more retired walks of the profession, may not indeed be called to the exercise of critical knowledge of this higher order; and all may not be equal to it.

But, all *are* called upon to give their best application to the acquisition of such knowledge of their profession as they *can* attain. The enemy is everywhere sowing his tares. False opinions, and wrong notions of Christianity, abound. They are plentifully spread in all directions. They surround us on every side. Can he, then, who has been appointed and named as the "Messenger, Watchman, and Steward of the Lord," be too vigilant, or too strongly fortified to repel them? Remember, that, under this denomination, we have each of us solemnly bound ourselves to be "ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word;" and that, for this purpose, as well as the others which pertain to our ministry, we would persevere with "diligence, in prayers, and in reading of the holy Scriptures, and in such studies, as help to the knowledge of the same."

Now, my reverend brethren, when the church has demanded of us such engagements on our entering into the ministry; when it has required of us, in the previous institution for it, so much of study, and such proofs of knowledge; when it has presented to us such difficulties to be surmounted, and such acquisitions to be made; can we conceive ours to be a profession, which releases us from the obligations of study, and leaves us at liberty to apply our time and thought to pursuits altogether foreign from its objects? And yet, unfortunately, there are persons of our order who act as if they thought so; and who, although they are often among the foremost to exclaim against the illiterate enthusiast, who deems himself qualified to teach the Gospel without the aids of learning or of study, yet in practice concur with him in the total disregard of both.

But to those of our brethren, who in any degree know and value their profession, it must be useless to dwell at greater length, upon the necessity of application and study for the proper discharge of its duties. The full knowledge of the grounds and evidences of our religion; an accurate acquaintance with its doctrines; a thorough familiarity with the Scrip-

tures of the Old and New Testament; a just appreciation of the arguments and objections which have been advanced, and are from day to day advanced, upon these several heads; together with the means of communicating with clearness and effect to others the results of this knowledge, so as to convey to their minds correct notions and vivid impressions, and, at the same time, to enforce upon them, with interest and power, a corresponding practice; must, to the minister who is anxious to perform his duty, appear rather to exceed the utmost exertion of his power and devotion of his time, than to leave to him any portion of either to employ on other objects. I shall, therefore, dismiss this subject, and only detain you with a few observations as to the mode in which we should conduct our own inquiries into religious truth, and our instruction of those who are committed to our spiritual teaching.

The Christian world is, unhappily, much divided on some points: and, even within the pale of our own church, differences have arisen, which interfere lamentably with that unity and harmony, which are so desirable in a Christian community. It might be expected, that the standard of doctrines, contained in the articles of our church, would have prevented this diversity, at least amongst all those who have embraced that admirable summary, as the rule of their Christian belief. But here, unfortunately, the difficulty recurs: and, such is the imperfection of human things, that that, which was designed to compose all differences of opinion, is itself converted into a cause of difference, and made a ground of acrimonious controversy.

The wisdom of the fathers of our church, a wisdom which seems little less than the result of inspiration, a wisdom certainly which marks its origin to have been from above, laid the foundation of this great scheme of Christian doctrine, in a deep knowledge of the nature of man, as well as of the things of God. Those excellent persons were well aware, that the minds of men are not all cast in the same mould; that, on the contrary, the varieties of the human understand-

ing are not less diversified than those of the human countenance; and that, as in the case of the latter, even where the closest resemblance exists, there are still found some features of characteristic difference; so in the former, even where the same general truths are embraced, some varying traits of thinking, and some distinguishing modes and qualifications of the primary principle will present themselves in different minds. The framers of our articles, therefore, did not determine to proceed as in a mathematical right line; but advanced in a path of reasonable and scriptural latitude; which, whilst it comprised within it all that was essential in doctrine, excluded all that was erroneous; and which, consequently, enabled those, who agreed in the great fundamental truths of the gospel, to walk together in Christian harmony, as became those who were brethren in Christ Jesus. Now, in the same spirit, in which the articles of our church were at first propounded, they should continue to be received, and taught. And no individual should conceive himself at liberty,—not even the highest in the church, who, in this case has no more right than the lowest,—to impose upon these articles any private sense, or comment of his own, to the exclusion of every other, that may not happen to agree with his in every particular. It is manifest, that he who does so, proposes a new test, different from that which has been sanctioned by the church to which we belong; and, so far, usurps an authority to which he has no title, and himself violates the standard by which he presumes injuriously to judge the orthodoxy of others.

To prove that this is a just view of the case, I shall read to you part of the declaration, which, by royal mandate, is prefixed to the articles; and which openly manifests the true spirit in which they were composed, and the duty of those who profess to submit to their direction. For the purpose of healing "the curious and unhappy differences which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ," the royal declaration observes, "We will, that all further curious search be laid

aside, and these disputes *shut up in God's promises*, as they be *generally set forth to us* in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the Church of England, according to them. And that no man hereafter shall print or preach to draw the article aside in any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and *shall not put his own sense or comment* to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

Thus, happily, through the wisdom of the church, we have *one* standard, not many. We are not left to the authoritative dictum of every confident person who shall assume more than oracular authority, and pronounce that *his* view, and his view only, of the doctrines of the church, as set forth in the articles, is the true one; but each individual is left to the "literal and grammatical sense" of the articles, and to his own conscience, to judge what they declare to be the doctrines of scripture: and the same articles refer him to that scripture, as the only authority by which they submit themselves to be tried. Thus we see, that, if the unity of the church be broken by the jarrings of those who exclude from the pale of her received doctrines all that differ from their peculiar views of orthodoxy, the articles are not the cause of this dissension. They pronounce that a certain latitude exists, within which, those who differ may conscientiously subscribe to a common creed: and those, on the other hand, who will admit no such latitude, contradict the articles which they profess to support; and, if they happen to possess authority in the church, they are fearfully responsible, as guilty of an act of *schism*, in driving from the church those who may be purer members of it than themselves; in raising up those curious questions and controversies which war with Christian concord; in rending asunder that one great family which should live together in brotherly union; and in setting up a variety of creeds, in place of the one admirable, comprehensive, and scriptural digest, under which the members

of our church have the happiness to enjoy a Christian freedom.

If any proof were wanting, that our articles are, as they profess to be, of a comprehensive character, it would be found in this, that, of the contending parties into which our church is unhappily divided, each claims them as its own. By those who hold the creed of Arminius, they are pronounced to be Arminian: and, by those who hold the creed of Calvin, they are pronounced to be Calvinistic. The natural inference of the impartial reasoner would be, that they are *neither;* whilst they contain within them what may be traced to some of the leading principles of *both.* And this is the truth. They are not enslaved to the dogmas of any party in religion. They are not Arminian. They are not Calvinistic. They are *scriptural.* They are *Christian.* As the different parties profess to derive their leading tenets from scripture, so do they profess to find them in the articles. But these are answerable for the extravagances of no sect; and are as far removed from the unjustifiable assumption, that man is sufficient for his own salvation, as they are from the monstrous metaphysics, that would render him in all respects a necessary agent, and altogether passive and inoperative in that great work.

At the same time, the true Christian teacher should not be deterred from setting forth the great fundamental doctrines which the articles contain, by the imputation of particular names, which ignorance may attach to those doctrines. Nothing, in truth, has contributed to give to some of the sects and parties in religion so much credit and popularity, as the erroneously ascribing to them, as characteristics of their peculiar creed, tenets which belong to our common Christianity. Thus, for example, nothing is more common at the present day, than to hear a person pronounced to be a Calvinist, because he holds the doctrine of *Original Sin*, or of *Justification by Faith;* whereas he might with equal justice be so denominated for holding the doctrines of the *Trinity*,

or the *Atonement*. But, let the honest and faithful servant of his Lord not fear to insist on all the great doctrines of the gospel, as they are laid before him in the articles. The fall of man, the atonement by Jesus Christ, the personality and divinity of the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of original and actual sin, the insufficiency of man to merit heaven by his own works, justification by faith, the need and nature of the divine influences, the importance of the Christian sacraments, the social, moral, and spiritual duties, which become the Christian, and which are to be grounded upon evangelical principles, on love to God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ:—these are the vital truths, which the articles fully justify him in preaching: and these are the truths, which, if preached zealously and honestly by the clergy of the established church, will not fail to uphold the credit of that church, whilst they promote the true cause of Christian holiness in these lands.

At the same time, it is particularly necessary to guard the young student in divinity against extremes on these very points. The ardour of youth requires to be restrained, not stimulated; it seizes upon strong points, and is disposed to take rapid views. The young preacher, therefore, should be particularly careful and suspicious of himself. He is in great danger of identifying himself with partisans, who are ever watchful to enrol him amongst their ranks. And, therefore, until he has time and opportunity to take a comprehensive and scriptural view of the gospel, and fully to acquaint himself with the opinions and arguments of experienced and eminent divines, he will be much safer in not pushing his bark adventurously from the shore. His preaching should be moderated on these great leading points, and dealing more in their results of holiness and good living, than in the schemes and systems to which they may seem to lead.

I have been drawn on, my reverend brethren, to dwell at greater length on these important subjects than is altogether reasonable, considering the season of the year at which we

are assembled, and the quantity of business which remains for us to bring within the compass of the day. I shall, therefore, omit, for the present, the farther consideration of these, and some other points not less important, and shall only add to what I have said upon the last head, that, as the business of a preacher of the gospel is not merely to convince, but to persuade, so, in our discourses to our congregation, we should hold this end always in view. It is not enough, that we prove from the pulpit what is true and sound in religion, we must endeavour also to make it be loved and followed. For this, it is manifest, we must interest the feelings, as well as satisfy the judgment of our hearers: and, therefore, we should take pains (to the utmost of our power) to employ both language and manner, such as may produce this effect; earnest and impressive, at the same time discreet and temperate; holding this still and constantly in view, that no powers of eloquence (did we possess them) can, in themselves, be sufficient for the due discharge of our ministry. Our addresses from the pulpit, to produce the full impression, must be accompanied by a language which is understood by all; the language of a holy and exemplary life. This is a more persuasive rhetoric than any tongue or speech can express: or, at least, this is a rhetoric, without which the highest powers of eloquence are lost; without which they become but *as the sounding brass, and as the tinkling cymbal.*

Now, my reverend brethren, I take my leave for the present. But, before I do so, I must add, that there are, happily, amongst your number, several, who exhibit the fairest specimen of those clerical excellencies which I have endeavoured to enforce. And I offer my sincere thanks to our heavenly Father, that, when it was his good will to place me in a station of such great responsibility as that which has been allotted to me, it has also been his will that I should have the aids of many pious and learned clergymen, to whom, in all matters requiring the assistance of piety and learning, I can confidently resort; and from whom, I am sure, at all

times, of that cordial co-operation, which the feelings of friendship in our early days, and those of the Christian brotherhood, in which we have been more closely connected in these latter times, render at once so gratifying and so beneficial. Of the great body of the clergy at large, to whom I stand at present related, I cannot but speak in terms of sincere respect. There are very few, indeed, to whom I do not feel it justly due to pay the tribute of high commendation. And of the younger members who have been lately introduced into this diocese, I am bound to say, that the diligence, the activity, the zeal, and, at the same time, the moderation with which they have commenced their pastoral labours, afford a happy presage of their future usefulness; and to myself they yield the pleasure of a paternal joy, in contemplating the course of those whom I deem my children in Christ, as one which, if persevered in, will end in blessings to themselves and benefits to their flocks in this world, and in the rewards reserved for the faithful servants of their great Master in the world that is to come.

To *all* the clergy of this diocese I have to express my gratitude for the readiness and cheerfulness with which they have complied with the several points of discipline which I have thought it my duty to introduce; and especially those which relate to the subject of residence; on which I can say, to your great credit, that I am confident there is no diocese within the jurisdiction of the United Church, in which its rules are more punctually and perseveringly observed.

And now, my reverend brethren, let us all join in putting up our prayers to our Almighty Father and Lord, that all of us, filling the several stations and orders in our sacred profession, may, in the admirable words of our Ordination Service, be so replenished by the divine grace, with the truth of Christ's doctrine, and so adorned by him with innocency of life, that both by word and good example we may faithfully serve him in this office, to the glory of his name, and the edification of his church, through His merits, who liveth and reigneth with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, world without end.

NOTES.

P. 401, line 11.—"From this place." THESE words are used in contradistinction to the written communications transmitted on various points of diocesan regulation.

P. 401, line 12.—"Triennial visitation."

The system of visitation in this part of the United Kingdom is attended with great advantage to the church. The bishops holding the visitations of their respective dioceses *every* year, and the Archbishop of each province holding a visitation in the several dioceses of his province once in every *third* year; the bishop is hereby made better acquainted with his clergy and the concerns of his diocese, and is at the same time rendered the more vigilant in the discharge of his duty, as being subject to the revision of a superior, whose more extended knowledge of the condition of the national church gives him ampler means of overseeing for the good of the whole.

P. 407, line 28.—"The canons."

The CANONS do not necessarily belong to the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER; but they are commonly printed with it, and every clergyman should be careful, that the Prayer-books for the use of his church contain them. This is not only proper in itself, but it is the bounden duty of the clergyman, specially prescribed by royal authority, which has commanded that the book of the Canons be provided for every church.

It is, indeed, to be lamented, that sufficient attention is not employed in the selection of the Prayer-books provided by the churchwardens for the use of parish churches throughout this country. In consequence of this it often happens, that even the Prayer-book appropriated to the clergyman's use, is without the CANONS, and not unfrequently without the ARTICLES. It also sometimes occurs, even in places of worship otherwise respectably appointed, that the *English* Prayer-book is the one provided for the reading desk: an incorrectness, which is not only attended with inconvenience, inasmuch as the English Prayer-book is unprovided with the *Prayer for the Lord Lieutenant*, as well as with the Forms of Prayer for the 23*rd of October* and for the *Visitation of Prisoners*, (all of which are authorized constituent parts of the Irish Prayer-book,) but which also leads to error by prescribing the *English Canons* in place of the *Irish*, and still more by presenting a *Rubric* enjoining the *publication of banns* after the Second Lesson, which by a special act of Parliament has been made legal in *England*, instead of their publication after the Nicene Creed, which publication is the only legal one in *Ireland*.

Indeed, on this subject of the *publication of banns*, there is a remarkable inaccuracy in our authorized Book of Common Prayer for Ireland; one Rubric directing the publication to be made immediately after the Nicene Creed, and another (prefixed to the Office for Matrimony) requiring it to be made immediately "before the Sentences of the Offertory," which sentences

being read after the sermon, (if there be one,) it follows, that by the one Rubric the banns are to be published *before* the sermon, and by the other they are to be published *after* it. This was probably occasioned by the introduction of the first of the three Rubrics which follow the Nicene Creed, in a wrong place, at the last review of the Common Prayer, at which time that Rubric was first inserted. This supposition accounts also for the apparent contradiction as to the time of reading the *Exhortation* to the Communion. The mistake requires to be rectified, and may be removed by a slight transposition.

P. 415, line 22.—"The versions of that holy book."

In the version of the Old Testament lately attempted by Mr. Bellamy, not only has the true meaning been obscured, distorted, and misunderstood; but, unfortunately, in the endeavour to recommend this *new* translation, every disparagement has been cast upon the *old;* and, by a person who has proved himself every way disqualified for so great a work, charges of ignorance and incompetency have been heaped upon those profoundly learned men and distinguished scholars, to whom we are indebted for the inestimable treasure of our authorized version of the Bible. It is to no purpose, that the Bishop of St. David's, Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Todd, and others (amongst whom the Editors of the Quarterly Review are not the least conspicuous) have demonstrated the utter incapacity of this new translator, and the emptiness of his charges against the received version. This is of weight only with educated persons, to whom these points must be sufficiently manifest. But with the uninformed mass, with whom accusation is generally equivalent to proof, mischief not easily repaired is wrought; and the impression, that our English Bible is not to be relied upon as the faithful vehicle of the divine word, is made upon minds, from which such an impression, once made, will not readily be effaced. Of this impression, not only the infidel, who wishes to undermine all revelation, but the Romanist, the Socinian, and all who are adverse to that pure form of Christianity which is established in these countries, are ardent to avail themselves. And thus the distinguished names, that have been rashly employed to bestow a credit upon such an adventurer in sacred literature as Mr. Bellamy, are made to minister to the designs of those who labour to overturn the established religion of the land.

As to the modern *Socinian* versions of Scripture, which, from their arbitrary insertions and rejections, and their total disregard and ignorance of grammar and idiom, and the received use of words, may be considered rather as fabrications than translations, little need be said. They have been abundantly exposed by various writers; and with the scholar and the man of learning they can have no reception. But, to the ignorant and the uneducated, the confident and overbearing tone of their editors is imposing and attractive: and to such it is necessary to prove the utter incompetence of those false guides, who, under the pretence of a purer exposition of the sacred text, would fasten upon it the most pernicious perversion of the divine truth. One of the principal writers of this unchristian sect has lately presented to the world a translation of the Epistles of St. Paul, in which the notable discovery is made, that this illustrious Apostle conceived that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Maker and Redeemer of the world, the Judge of mankind, He whom the Apostle himself has pronounced to be "God over all, blessed for evermore," was in reality in all respects a mere man like himself!

P. 418, line 30.—"The declaration."

The ROYAL DECLARATION here referred to stands entire as follows:

ARTICLES agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at *London* in the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of

opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion: reprinted by his Majesty's commandment, with his royal declaration prefixed thereunto.

HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION.

Being by God's ordinance, according to our just title, *Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church, within these our Dominions*, We hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the church committed to Our charge, in the unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the church and commonwealth. We have, therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following:

That the Articles of the Church of *England* (which have been allowed and authorized heretofore, and which Our clergy generally have subscribed unto,) do contain the true doctrine of the Church of *England* agreeable to God's word: which We do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all Our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles; which to that end We command to be new printed, and this Our declaration to be published therewith.

That We are supreme governor of the Church of *England:* And that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the *Injunctions, Canons,* and other *Constitutions* whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under Our broad seal so to do; and We approving their said ordinances and constitutions; providing that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land.

That out of Our princely care that the churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the bishops and clergy, from time to time, in convocation, upon their humble desire, shall have licence under Our broad seal to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as being made plain to them, and assented unto by Us, shall concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England* now established; from which We will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree.

That for the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet We take comfort in this, that all clergymen within Our realm have always most willingly subscribed to the articles established; which is an argument to Us, that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said articles; and that even in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the articles of the Church of *England* to be for them: which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the articles established.

That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, We will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the Church of *England* according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

That if any public reader in either of Our universities, or any head or master of a college, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any

public disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the universities or colleges respectively; or if any divine in the universities shall preach or print any thing either way, other than is already established in convocation with Our royal assent; he, or they the offenders, shall be liable to Our displeasure, and the church's censure in Our commission ecclesiastical, as well as any other: and We will see there shall be due execution upon them.

This DECLARATION has been stated by Dr. Burn, in his Ecclesiastical Law, (vol. i. p. 90, 2d ed.,) to have been prefixed to the *articles* by the authority of James I. In this he has been followed by Bullingbrook, (Eccl. Law, vol. i. p. 401,) and also by a late writer on ecclesiastical law, of considerable merit, Mr. Williams (p. 22). But this is not the case, and the error in Burn on this head has been corrected in a recent edition of the work. It was first issued in 1628 by Charles I. And we are told by Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, that Archbishop Laud, "for silencing the controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, procured the reprinting of the Thirty-nine Articles, with the *Royal Declaration* prefixed at the head of them," (ii. 476.) The same historian afterwards adds, "The Calvinian party complained loudly of this *Declaration:* they gave out, that the design of it was chiefly for the suppressing orthodox books, for the discouraging godly ministers from preaching the comfortable doctrines of man's election to eternal happiness, and for promoting the growth of Arminianism."

From this it would seem to follow, and indeed from the fact that the *Declaration* was framed under the counsels of Archbishop Laud it might reasonably be inferred, that the *Declaration* was designed to favour the Arminian interpretation. At the same time it has been contended by the advocates of the opposite doctrine, (especially in Overton's *True Churchman*, pp. 46—48,) that the *Declaration* gives support to the Calvinistic sense of the articles. So that, in truth, what the *Declaration* pronounces of the articles,—that the opposite parties in the Church of England "take the articles to be for them,"—seems not less true of the *Declaration* itself: a state of the case agreeable to that which the full investigation of the subject cannot but establish to any fair mind; namely, that this *Declaration* went to authorize such a latitude of interpretation, as might enable both the contending parties conscientiously to subscribe to the articles of the Church of England.

I have thought it the more necessary to set forth the entire *Declaration* in this place, because it has so happened, that, in the editions of the Book of Common Prayer for Ireland, the articles have been commonly printed *without* the *Declaration*. This must have been an accidental omission; for the English articles have been adopted by the Church of Ireland in the year 1634, for the purpose (as it is declared in the first canon) of effecting a perfect agreement in doctrine between the two churches, and the King's authority in the concerns of the church being the same in the one country as in the other, the *Royal Declaration* must be considered as a like authoritative rule in both, and therefore in both connected itself alike essentially with the articles common to the two churches. Since these two churches have been consolidated into one united church, the matter can admit of no appearance of question. But, in truth, from the year 1634, the two churches have been in all respects the same. The Church of Ireland having at that time, by its formal recognition (in its first four canons) of the *doctrine, orders, liturgy and government* of the Church of England, identified itself so completely with that church, that it has been in reality the Church of England, only under another name; and the union of the two churches has but completed that in form which before existed in substance.

P. 420, line 14.—"They are not Arminian: they are not Calvinistic."

With a *point*, that cannot redeem its *want of truth*, it has been said of our church, "We have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy." These words, which are unfortunately associated with the name of a distinguished statesman and illustrious orator, and from that alone are deserving of any serious consideration, have formed a favourite motto, and are in daily triumphant use, in the publications of the Sectarians, the Romanists, and all who labour to calumniate and overturn the Church of England. It has been commonly considered, that theologians do not form the best politicians. But, surely, it may, with at least as much truth, be asserted, that politicians are not always the soundest theologians. Had the noble person to whom these words are ascribed, been as loosely acquainted with the principles of the British constitution, as he has in these shewn himself to be with the doctrines and liturgy of the Church of England, and as little interested for the honour and welfare of the former, as he has here proved himself to be for those of the latter, a name, which now ranks high in the annals of England's most enlightened statesmen, would take its place only amongst those of the splendid declaimers, who glitter during their day of popularity, and are forgotten.

It surely is not too much to affirm of the noble author of this sentence, that he did not very accurately comprehend the meaning of the terms which he employed. The probability is, that, with the indifference with which politicians regard such subjects, he never condescended to examine with precision the doctrines either of Calvin or Arminius. Had he done so, he would have found that the doctrines of the Church of England are not the doctrines of Calvinism; and that the informed and intelligent clergy of that church are not the followers of Arminius.

Again, as to the charge of a *Popish liturgy*, this great man has fallen into the vulgar mistake of those who confound *Popery* with the *Catholic* religion. But it is always to be remembered, that the REFORMERS in England protested, not against the CATHOLIC CHURCH, but against POPERY, *in behalf of that church*. Their object was to preserve the purity of the *ancient and true Catholic Church* against the *novelties and corruptions* forced upon it by *Popery*. And therefore, although our Common Prayer-book abounds with what is *Catholic*, it is not disfigured by a single particle of what is *Popish*. The *English Catholic Church* (the true designation of the *Church of England*) need not desire to be exhibited in a stronger contrast to the *Church of Rome*, than by comparing *its* Prayer-book with the *Missal*.

A

CHARGE,

DELIVERED

AT HIS PRIMARY VISITATION,

IN

ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN.

ON

THURSDAY, THE 24TH OF OCTOBER, 1822.

A

CHARGE,

ETC.

To address the assembly which now surrounds me for the first time, upon objects so important as those for which it is convened, and which press with not a greater weight of responsibility on the members of this assembly than upon him by whom they are addressed, must be, at all seasons, a matter of serious and awful consideration. But, at the present, when the established clergy of this land are beset with difficulties and perils of more than common magnitude; when, not only the interests of our order, but those of religion itself are endangered; when, from the abounding of iniquity, the love of many has waxed cold; when more than usual hostility prevails against our Zion; and even our very good is too often evil spoken of;—it is impossible to enter upon the reflections, which belong to the nature and occasion of our meeting, without feelings of anxious and painful solicitude.

When, again, it is pressed upon our recollection, that, by the very event, by which (under the Providential arrangement) I have been, through His Majesty's good pleasure, placed in this station, the Church of Ireland has been deprived of one of its noblest and firmest supports; that the prelate, who, by the various high qualities which he possessed, was pre-eminently fitted to defend the church, over which he had so long presided with disinterested rectitude and Christian

truth, has been withdrawn at the moment when that church most needed such a defender,—I cannot but feel an increased inquietude, from the very occasion, which has empowered me to address the clergy of this united diocese upon this day.

And when, in addition to these considerations, I reflect, that the body of clergy here assembled, are a body, the most influential of any that can now be assembled within the limits of this island; that, from the commanding eminence which they occupy, and the conspicuous station which they fill, their conduct and their example must be attended with consequences to the community and to religion the most momentous; I must be but little affected indeed, by a concern for the spiritual welfare of our people, were I not deeply solicitous for the success of my present exhortation, in stirring up and invigorating, both in your breasts and my own, the sense of Christian duty, the saving spirit of Christian benevolence; the sense of Christian duty, in what relates to our own conduct; the spirit of Christian benevolence, in what relates to the salvation of others.

On these subjects, many among you, my reverend brethren, must often have seriously and deeply pondered, as became the solemn obligations which they had undertaken. To such, I can only serve as a remembrancer of what they already know. (And who, among us, does not require to be reminded of his duties?) To those who have either not fully acquainted themselves with the awful nature of the charge which has been committed to them, or who have been heedless or lukewarm in its execution, I must assume a different character; I must sound in their ears the duties, which they have disregarded; I must warn them, that, if they persevere in such neglect, the day will come, when they will be called upon to render the tremendous account of an unfaithful stewardship.

For what is the description, which our Ordination service presents, of the character, duties, and obligations of those who are admitted to the Christian ministry in our Church? Are they not there expressly represented, as the "Messengers,

Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord;" who are "to teach, and to premonish, to feed and to provide for the Lord's family?" Are they not warned to keep in constant "remembrance, how great a treasure is committed to their charge;" no less than "the sheep of Christ which he bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood:" and that "the church and congregation, whom they must serve, is his spouse and his body:" and that, "if it shall happen the same church or any member thereof, to take any hurt or hindrance by reason of their negligence," they should think with dread upon "the greatness of the fault, and the horrible punishment that will ensue:" that they should, therefore, considering with themselves the "end of their ministry towards the children of God, towards the spouse and body of Christ," beware, "that they never cease their labour, their care and diligence, until they have done all that lieth in them, according to their bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to their charge, into that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among them, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life?"

Well then, indeed, may they be solemnly called on (as they are immediately after) to "see, with what great care and study they ought to apply themselves; as well that they may shew themselves dutiful and thankful to the Lord, who hath placed them in so high a dignity; as also to be careful, that they neither themselves offend, nor be occasion that others offend;" and that, for this purpose, they should, as much as in them lies, "forsake and set aside all worldly cares and studies," and endeavour "by God's grace to give themselves wholly to the office, whereunto it hath pleased God to call them, so as to the utmost of their power, to apply themselves wholly to this one thing, and draw all their cares and studies this way; and that they will continually pray to God the Father, by the mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost, that, by daily

reading and weighing of the Scriptures, they may wax riper and stronger in their ministry; and that they may so endeavour themselves, from time to time, to sanctify the lives of them and theirs, and to fashion them after the rule and doctrine of Christ, that they may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the people to follow."

Is it not, then, demanded of them, in the most solemn manner, to bind themselves to all these things; declaring, as in the more immediate presence of God, and at his holy altar, that they believe themselves to be "truly called to the order and ministry of their priesthood, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of the church established in this realm;"—that "out of the Holy Scriptures they will carefully instruct the people committed to their charge;"—that they "will give their faithful diligence always to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this church and realm, according to the commandments of God, hath received the same;"—that they will be "ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and to use to the utmost of their power both public and private exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole within their respective cures;"—that they will be "diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh;"—that they will be "diligent also to frame and fashion themselves and their families according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both themselves and them (as much as in them lieth) wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ;"—that they will "maintain and set forward (to the utmost of their power) quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to their charge:" and finally, that they "will reverently obey their ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over them, following with a glad mind and will their godly ad-

monitions, and submitting themselves to their godly judgments?"

Here, my reverend brethren, are the awful duties, which we have taken upon us to discharge. Here are the promises, by which we have bound ourselves to our great Master. Here is the standard, by which we are to be tried, by ourselves, by the world, and above all, by our Eternal Judge. Happy, indeed, would it be for us, and for those committed to our care, could we bear to be measured by this standard. And yet, if not, what must be the consequence, both to ourselves, and to those who are entrusted to us:—if we do not at least endeavour, through the divine grace, to approach towards the fulfilment of this our bounden duty!

It will, surely, be admitted by all, that the person, who has engaged himself by such solemn obligations, should have something to distinguish him, in his life and conversation, from those who live after the ordinary habits and manners of the world. And yet, is this always found to be the case in fact? Let us ask ourselves honestly the question, are there not some among us, who present no such distinctive appearances? Are there not some, who manifest no anxiety for the salvation of those who are committed to their spiritual charge? Some, who seem to view the church, merely as the means of livelihood; who appear to consider the promises made by them at their ordination, but as words of form; and who, provided they discharge, with tolerable regularity, such external acts as are indispensably required for the tenure of their office and its emoluments, afford but little reason to suppose that they concern themselves about its weightier duties; or rather, indeed, seem desirous to escape from every appearance of sanctity or piety, which might bear the stamp of their sacred profession, deeming it a higher honour to mix upon equal terms with the general mass of society, and to merge the minister of the gospel in the gentleman and the man of the world?

It were a lamentable thing, if such cases were numerous. I trust in God they are not. In the diocese from which I

have been lately removed, they were rare indeed. My very recent introduction into this diocese does not enable me to pronounce with the like certainty upon it. But, from what I have seen, there seems reason to form the most favourable anticipations. Yet, it is to be feared, we have, all of us, too much cause to apprehend, that, even with our best exertions, we have fallen far short of the demands of duty; and that, by a deficiency of zeal and devotedness in the one great cause, we and those who have gone before us in the ministry of the established church, have to answer for no small portion of that irreligion, which now too fatally prevails among our people; and which, whatever be our share in its production, repays it by the severe retaliation of obloquy and ill will, which it heaps unsparingly upon our order.

Perhaps, indeed, at no time within the memory of any now living, has the established clergy, as a body, been less deserving of reproach than at the present: and certainly, the exertions of a considerable proportion of its members are deserving of the highest praise. And yet, at no time, it is to be feared, has an indifference to religion been more prevalent, or a disrespect to its lawful and established ministry been more extended.

That the decrease of religion should be accompanied with the dislike of its ministers, is the natural course of things. But there are causes, connected with the local circumstances of this country, which aggravate the evil. Political considerations, unfortunately, make it the interest of many, whose condition is influential, to court the favour of those who are hostile to the established church. And therefore, in their property, their character, and their teaching, the clergy of the national religion are resisted and oppressed. In *their* persons, it is deemed by many to be no violation of justice, to infringe or evade the laws, which are designed to protect the maintenance of all; no violation of candour, to yield a ready belief to the most injurious reports, on grounds of evidence, which would not be admitted in the case of others. Exposed to assaults from various points, and in opposite directions,

they are accused frequently of faults, which are opposite and incompatible: their opinions being at the same time censured as being too strict and too relaxed; whilst their practices are condemned by some, as being too much accommodated to the manners of the world, and by others, as assuming a character of particularity, which must diminish their usefulness as members of society. One plain fact, that proves the malevolence with which our order is too generally viewed, is this, that the faults of individuals of the body are almost always ascribed to the body at large. The individual offence is charged as an universal stigma. Whereas, respect for the order should rather soften down the offence of the individual, as the feelings of the child would cover the infirmities of the parent: or, at most, the offence of the individual should be treated as the exception, and visited with the condemnation it deserves upon the offender alone.

But why do I dwell upon these things? Not, surely, for the purpose of encouraging an indifference to opinions, even thus unjustly formed, much less to rouse a spirit of hostility and opposition to those who treat our order with such undeserved reproach and injury. No, our business is not to *render railing for railing.* My object is, on the contrary, to excite to an increase of vigilance and energy in our calling; and to impress the necessity of employing every means in our power to mitigate the malignity of our adversaries; and above all means, that of the faithful discharge of our duties, which, if it does not disarm our enemies of their virulence against us, will at least disarm it of its sting; and, of all duties, more particularly that of kindness and good will, even to those at whose hands we have experienced most unkindness.

It must be manifest that, in the observations hitherto made, I have not adverted to that description of persons (of whom we have unhappily at present but too many) whose avowed object is to overturn the established religion of the country; and who, the better to effect their purpose, labour to enlist the rapacity of the unprincipled in their unholy warfare;

holding out the spoils of the temple, as the reward of its subversion; and representing its ministers, at all times, in such odious colours, as may reconcile one class of the community the more readily to their spoliation, and another even to their personal extinction: insomuch that, at this day, the national clergy are placed in a state little short of direct persecution, though under the apparent protection of the law.

Against such adversaries our order can derive no security from their virtues or their religion. These would only present greater impediments to the accomplishment of the purpose of pillage, and excite greater provocation. Against such agents other safeguards are necessary; the same which are required for the preservation of the state itself. Yet, even to these, although we can have no hope of subduing them by Christian forbearance and mildness, it is still the part of prudence, if not of duty, to employ them. Railing (it has been already observed) is not our province. That is a contest in which we should be outdone. And in attempting it, we should only give fresh advantage to our enemies; who, though devoid of the Christian spirit themselves, would not fail to turn the want of it in us, to the discredit of the religion which we profess. In all cases, passion and bitterness are to be avoided; and even in our moments of firmest resistance to the wrongs which are heaped upon us, we should never forget, that in ours is involved a greater cause than our own; and that there are no wounds so deadly to the interests of religion, as those which are inflicted by the misconduct of its professors.

Upon the whole our course is a plain one. Whatever be the obloquy, or the dangers, which we have to encounter, we have one single line to pursue. We have to preserve our allegiance to our heavenly Master. We have bound ourselves by the most solemn vows to his service. We have bound ourselves to advance his glory, and the interests of his kingdom amongst men, by all the powers which we possess. And we have, therefore, to pass onward, *through good*

report and evil report, fulfilling his holy will, and labouring, in the true spirit of self-devotedness, by every means that can be employed, by instruction, by example, by the very expenditure of life itself, if necessary, to promote the cause of God and the well being of our fellow men.

Without such exertions, it is plain, that we neither can nor ought to stand. *If the salt has lost its savour, it is good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot.* Common exertions, it is manifest, will not now suffice. Irreligion, and false religion, abound. We have fallen on evil days, and evil tongues. And there is no slumbering on our post. We may rest assured, that if we join lukewarmness from within, to the unceasing hostility which assails us from without, and assails us in every form and degree from the false and hypocritical pretence of a desire for the improvement of our order, to the open violence which avows the purpose of its extinction,—the triumph of those who labour for the downfall of our church will soon be completed.

It will not do to boast of our orthodoxy, and shew no fruit of right opinions in our practice; to content ourselves with exclaiming against what is called *new light*, without endeavouring to extend to our flocks the benefit of the *old;* to be fearful of an excess of zeal, without any alarm as to the consequence of indifference; and to reserve for the appearance of sanctity and separation from the world amongst our brethren, the indignation and censure which should be bestowed upon levity of demeanour and habitual carelessness about spiritual concerns.

The time is come, when, if not from higher considerations, we must, from prudence at least, bring these things to an end. The time is come when we must shew ourselves, in truth and in spirit, what we profess ourselves to be, the soldiers and servants of Christ; when we must manifest in our lives, the superior excellence of that pure and reformed religion, which we have undertaken to teach. And, whilst we object to the inveterate and unscriptural corruptions of one form, and to the schismatical irregularities of others, we

should prove ourselves to be the genuine ministers of that APOSTOLICAL and CATHOLIC church, which has descended to us freed from the abuses of antiquated error; and present ourselves to the world, as the worthy depositaries of the sacred trust committed to our keeping. For this, we must, one and all, devote ourselves to the work of our ministry. Between the highest and the lowest classes of our order there should be but one object: and the only rivalry among us should be, which should labour most in the duties of his calling.

In this, my reverend brethren, I am well aware, to how strict a scrutiny I expose myself: for it is no slight work, to which they are summoned, who are appointed to the office of chief pastor in our church. It is, indeed, a great error, to suppose that their duties are light. It is not possible to conceive a more awful weight of responsibility, resting on the conscience of a human being, than that which is imposed upon a Christian bishop. So to govern in the church of Christ, that "the ministry be not blamed." So to exercise superintendence, that, in the language of the solemn office of consecration, the authority conferred may be "used not to destruction, but to salvation; not to hurt, but to help;" and (to continue the language of the same office) to be "so merciful, as not to be too remiss; so to minister discipline, as not to forget mercy:" to be "earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke, with all patience and doctrine," being at the same time "to such as believe a wholesome example:" to be "faithful in ordaining and laying hands upon others:" to labour "to banish all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same:" to "maintain and set forward (as much as possible) quietness, love and peace among all men; and such as be unquiet, disobedient and criminous, to correct and punish according to such authority as is given by God, and by the ordinances of the realm:"—in a word, to act, in all respects, the part of a faithful governor and a kind father; at the head of one great Christian

family, the counsellor and friend of all whose heart is in the spirit of their calling; the firm and undaunted reprover of those who shew themselves unworthy of the charge which they have undertaken.

To do all this, likewise, in the midst of a wilful and perverse generation, in which the spirit of resistance is abroad, adds not a little to the difficulty of the task. There was a time, indeed, when religion was loved, and its ministers consequently respected. The government of the church was then comparatively easy; and he, who was truly desirous honestly to discharge his duty, seldom failed to obtain, amongst higher rewards, the reward of a just approbation. Now the state of things is so far altered, that the general search is, to discover where to blame: and the exercise, or the dereliction, of authority, is alike made the subject of condemnation. Should the authority, vested in the heads of the church, *not* be exerted for the purpose of control, the misconduct of the clergy is ascribed (and justly) to *their* neglect. It is then carefully remembered, that the chief end for which bishops are appointed, is to control and to correct. If, on the contrary, that authority *be* exercised in the just discharge of their duty, then the refractory offender becomes the object of general sympathy; he suffers under the exercise of power; all his allegations, however false and improbable, obtain a ready belief; and the tyranny of a dominant priesthood forms the theme of the popular declaimer: and, yet more to increase the evil, the falsehoods, which are sent abroad, must be left without public refutation, that a name and station, which should be respected, may not be dragged into familiar association with the scurrilities of a degenerate press.

However, these are small difficulties to him, who has rightly learned the nature of his office, and to whom the tauntings and revilings of worthless men should be as nothing, but so far as they may, unhappily, impress the ignorant and unreflecting with feelings and wrong opinions, that may impede the usefulness of the ministry, and, through the character of

its teachers, injure the interests of religion. He must still pursue his onward way, without disturbance. Whilst he repels the froward, he must cherish all who are willing to assist him in the glorious work of bringing souls to God. And, at the same time that he is ready to hail, as a friend and a brother, every fellow labourer, even of the lowest order in the church, who exercises his ministry in godly sincerity and wholesome subordination, he should be fearless and immoveable, in executing the necessary discipline, against the highest of those under his jurisdiction, who are either remiss in the great duties of their office, or offend against the established order of their station.

In truth, the value of a sound discipline in the church cannot be easily appreciated: and it deeply concerns *all* its members to assist in its support. If the several parts of the system be not kept in their due place and relative proportion, the whole must be dissolved. There is no longer harmony, and union, and brotherly co-operation: but discord, dissension, and hostile repulsion must spring up in their stead, and defeat the entire object for which the admirable constitution of our church was framed.

Perhaps, when well considered, it is not possible to conceive a more perfect scheme, than that under which we are enabled to exercise our Christian ministry: the great outline of which has been traced for us by divine authority, and the parts filled up by the best adaptations of human wisdom, fitting it to the condition, and applying it to the exigencies of human things; insomuch, that they, who, through an ambition of independence, or a fondness for their own opinions, have refused to submit themselves to the order of things which *it* establishes, have been compelled to bear evidence to its excellence, by adopting in most cases a similitude to this very system, which we derive from Apostolic authority, and adjust to the Apostolic standard, but which will not satisfy those, who love only what is new, or who are unwilling to conform to any rule but what they have made for themselves.

It has been the custom with such as are disposed to depreciate the character of the established church of these countries, to represent its government, and its hierarchy, as matters of mere human arrangement, and depending for their authority solely upon civil institution. Many, even of the members of our church, are habituated to view the system, as founded upon the state, and as deriving from *it* its title to obedience. This is a gross mistake. Its *adoption* by the state does not affect its origin, or its title. These are of a nature higher than any human constitution can reach. They are derived from that spiritual principle, which makes allegiance itself a duty. And the rights of the episcopacy and the priesthood, were they at this moment severed from the state, would not be less cogent over conscience, from the divine authority which they possess, than when backed by the power, and enforced by the penalties of law. The Romanist, therefore, on the one hand, and the Independent on the other, alike mistake or misrepresent the character of our church, when they would describe it as built on human authority, and not as standing on that great CATHOLIC foundation, on which it has been placed by our Lord and his Apostles.

I am the more desirous to press this consideration upon the members of the church, that they may be led to feel, that, in offending against that sound discipline, which is necessary for its well being, they not merely violate the laws of man, but they infringe the ordinances of God; they not only incur the penalties of a temporal offence, but they expose themselves to the consequences of a spiritual transgression.

Happily, the wisdom, by which the civil constitution of our church was framed, has partaken so largely of that higher wisdom, by which its spiritual foundations were established, that the leading regulations of its national conformation are directly calculated to secure the great points of Catholic discipline. So that, the most enthusiastic admirers of the primitive purity of the government of the church, will have little to desire in abiding by the principles of that ecclesias-

tical polity, by which the frame of our national church has been adjusted. And, whatever deficiency may be found in that respect, is more to be ascribed to the ignorance or the mistaken liberality of those who do not act up to the principles of that polity, than to any imperfection in the polity itself.

There are but too many, who profess to be zealous members of our national church, and yet are altogether ignorant of the authority on which that church is founded. And, again, there are too many possessing greater knowledge upon this subject, but who are at the same time fearful of incurring the charge of bigotry, by contending for the *apostolical origin and succession of the Christian ministry;* the only ground, on which the just rights of the church can be maintained, and on which the duty of strict communion with it can be legitimately enforced.

We, my reverend brethren, are placed in a station, in which we are hemmed in by two opposite descriptions of professing Christians: the one, possessing a church, without what *we* can properly call a religion; and the other, possessing a religion, without what *we* can properly call a church: the one so blindly enslaved to a supposed infallible ecclesiastical authority, as not to seek in the word of God a reason for the faith they profess; the other, so confident in the infallibility of their individual judgment as to the reasons of their faith, that they deem it their duty to resist all authority in matters of religion. We, my brethren, are to keep clear of both extremes; and holding the Scriptures as our great charter, whilst we maintain the liberty with which Christ has made us free, we are to submit ourselves to the authority to which he has made us subject.

From this spirit of tempered freedom and qualified submission sprung the glorious work of the REFORMATION, by which the church of these countries, having thrown off the trammels of a slavish superstition, burst forth in the purified form of Christian renovation: and, having flung aside the novelties of human invention, presented to the world the

fair picture of the *true, and genuine, and ancient* CATHOLIC CHURCH, retaining all that authority, and entitled to all that reverence, which belonged to the early church, of which it is the disencumbered and legitimate continuation.

Now, by the same spirit, by which our church was thus restored, can it only be preserved: and from the decay of that spirit it is, that schism and confusion have arisen to disturb its tranquillity and impair its benefits. Not only have disputes and divisions, to the great triumph of infidelity and irreligion, broken off from us and multiplied various sects, which profess, that for conscience sake they reject our errors, as we did those of the church of Rome; but also, amongst ourselves, and within our own pale, a sectarian spirit has been engendered in the indulgence of an unqualified exercise of individual judgment, which, from want of due knowledge and a full comprehension of the relations and consequences of things, is sure to issue, either in an unauthorized assumption of rights, to which there is no just title, or in an inconsiderate abandonment of duties, to which a more enlightened conscience must feel itself bound to submit.

There is one important respect in which these evil consequences are so glaring at the present day, that I must beg to direct your attention to them, in that reference, at somewhat greater length. And I must notice them in a twofold view, both as they concern the laity, and as they concern the clergy.

The former, exercising their right of private judgment, too generally imagine, that they are at perfect liberty to frequent what place of worship they choose, and to attend whatever minister they like. And, the latter, exercising the same right, too frequently hold themselves free to officiate where they please; satisfying themselves, that if the clerical duty be discharged, it matters not, whether it be discharged by the regularly appointed minister or not. Hence, as the layman wanders from church to church, so do the clergy indulge a like rambling and vagrant disposition: both forgetting, that

there is a *pastoral* relation, that binds the clergyman to his flock, and the flock to their clergyman. And, indeed, it is not to be wondered, that if the clergyman loses sight of this relation, the layman should become insensible to it likewise.

Churchmen are not perhaps aware, that, in deserting their parish church, to seek out some minister agreeable to their taste, or even one from whom they imagine they receive most edification, they are departing from the true spirit of the church, and adopting the principle of the dissenter, who contends for the sovereign exercise of his will in the election of his minister. The same feelings also, which lead the individual from church to church, will naturally lead him from the church to the conventicle. The young persons of his family, likewise, are trained up in the same course. Thinking meanly of their parish minister, and exercising a premature judgment upon the merits of different teachers, they are taught to bring with them to their place of worship the feelings of a critic, not the docility of a learner: they are to judge their minister by their own doctrines and opinions, not to receive instruction from his lips. And thus, the members of our church, instead of looking to their parish minister as their pastor and guide, instead of yielding to him the reverence that is due to his office, and affording to him by their regular attendance on his ministrations the fair encouragement and reward of his exertions, humbly hoping on their parts to receive a blessing through his labours,—openly mark him out to others as insufficient to their instruction, discountenance the duty of attending the parish church, and recommend by their example the spirit of wandering, and the love of novelty; feelings, which are in direct opposition to the steady sobriety of true religion; which excite the desire of what is new and striking, rather than of what is just and useful; begetting a principle of partisanship; leading to a dissatisfaction with things as they are; and which, amounting in fact to a spirit of *secession*, seldom fail to end in sectarian separation, if not in the individuals themselves, at least in

their families, who have been trained up from childhood under such powerful influences of alienation.

But, it is most carefully to be considered by the parochial clergy, how far their practices may contribute to generate such a spirit: how far their negligence, or frequent absence from their appropriate station, or their substitution of others for the discharge of duties properly their own, may have produced this evil, by undermining the respect and interest with which the parish minister should always be viewed; by rendering it in some degree necessary to seek instruction and edification from others; and by familiarizing their hearers to that variety, which, whilst it distracts, is at the same time in its own nature too apt to present injurious attractions. Nay, it is well worth the consideration of the pious and well disposed parish minister, whether he also does not afford encouragement to this spirit, if he wanders from the post allotted to him, even for the purpose of conferring a temporary benefit in another place by his exertions. To such men, I know I shall be intelligible, when I recommend it to them to consider well the danger of preferring *imaginary* to *known* duties.

Such is the beauty and excellence of the system of our church, and such the perfection of order which it enjoins, that within it each minister has his own proper station assigned to him by the due authority; *from* which station he is not at liberty to depart, nor *to* it has he any power to depute. Every clergyman may rest assured, that he is contributing most to the advancement of Christianity, when he confines his exertions to his own allotted sphere of action: the curate to his curacy; the rector to his parish; and the bishop to his diocese. Thus is formed one great chain, which binds all to their duties.

The true relation of the clergy to the people (it cannot be too often repeated) is a *pastoral* relation. It is not by the parish minister's securing the ostensible discharge of the Sunday's duty, that he properly exercises his functions; nor even by his providing for a punctual attention to those occa-

sional duties which he is invited to discharge. No, the clergyman should be the true *parish priest;* in continual contact with his flock; one, whose voice they know; not only in constant residence amongst them, but in continual intercourse with them; their adviser; their friend; the moderator of their disputes; the composer of their differences; the careful instructor of their children; not content merely to afford spiritual aid where it may be demanded, but vigilant to discover where it may be applied, and prompt to bestow it where it will be received: stimulating all, and particularly the young, to come to that fountain of living waters, which it is his office to dispense; and proving to his people by every possible exertion, that the first object he has at heart is their everlasting welfare.

All this, it is manifest, he can effect only by living continually amongst his flock, and by the continued *personal* discharge of the several offices of the priesthood. And this, indeed, is his bounden duty. The parish minister has no right to depute another to the charge assigned to him, but under the special authority by which that charge had been conveyed. There is no point on which the laws of the church are more peremptory and more unqualified, than on this, that no person shall exercise the functions of a preacher or parish minister without the express permission of the bishop, within whose diocese he wishes to officiate. Essentially connected with this, is the injunction of the law, which demands that no person be admitted into holy orders, without a true and real nomination to some cure in which he is to serve. An exception indeed is made with respect to certain collegiate bodies, in which, it is presumed, the members will have a proper and prescribed sphere for clerical occupation. But careful provision is made, that there shall be no *idle* clergyman; none without some church or fixed station to which he shall be appointed. And, agreeably to this, the course of duty is plainly marked out, and the range of it precisely limited for each individual minister, by the very terms of his admission to orders, as well as by those of his

subsequent appointments in the church. At his ordination his commission is conveyed and restricted by these words, addressed to him by the bishop: "Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to administer the holy sacraments, *in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereto.*" By the rules of our church, then, it is manifest that the authority of the minister to preach and exercise the clerical functions, is, under the very condition of his ordination, strictly confined to the congregation to which he shall be lawfully appointed: and this appointment is afterwards exactly defined by the institution or the license which places him at his proper post.

Thus, it appears, that the commission, which is given, is not a vague one, allowing the clergyman to rove at pleasure, and exercise his ministerial office wherever and however he may think fit. This is the system (if such it may be called) to prevent which, the laws of our church are specially enacted. This is the very spirit of sectarianism, the total destruction of order, and the direct subversion of the church of England.

The individual must be lawfully appointed to his particular post. He must be appointed to it, by the only lawful authority, which the church admits, the authority of the bishop; in whom is vested the weighty responsibility of assigning to each his place, and, as far as in him lies and as his powers extend, allotting to the individual minister, the station to which he is most adapted.

The better to effect this, the bishop is required by the laws of the church, to examine minutely into the several qualifications of the clergyman to whose hands he is about to entrust the parochial charge. Not only is the production of his letters of orders indispensably necessary, but testimonials also from clergymen of credit, both as to his life and doctrine, must be demanded. And, if he has previously officiated in any other diocese, testimonials must be adduced from that diocese, of the manner in which he has exercised his ministry there; and these testimonials, not only certified by grave and respectable ministers who vouch their actual knowledge on

this head, but also countersigned by the diocesan, testifying at least to the credibility of those whose signatures are annexed. Nor is this all. The bishop is yet, in addition, to examine the individual himself, so as to receive the fullest satisfaction as to his worthiness, in all respects, to be admitted to the weighty charge which is to be confided to him.

I will not detain you with reciting the canons, which require all these precautions. You will find them precisely and rigorously enjoined in the 30th, 31st, 32d, 33d, 38th, and 39th canons of our church: beside that they have been the uniformly acknowledged usage of the church, from the Reformation to the present day.

Nor can all this be deemed too much, when it is considered, that such are the only means, whereby the purity of the church can be preserved against the irruption of unlearned, immoral, or erroneous teachers. For this purpose the gates of the citadel must be well guarded. And the bishops must act as faithful sentinels. Yet what will all this care avail, if the very persons, who through this trying scrutiny are admitted to their respective stations in the church, will, without the knowledge of the bishop, assume the liberty to put others in their place? and, whilst they either absent themselves from their post, or wish to indulge their ease, transfer their flocks, which were specially intrusted to *them*, to the guidance of others, who have received no authority to act, of whom no trial has been had as to their sufficiency, no testimony afforded as to their morals and doctrines; who are under no obligation of canonical obedience; and who, for aught that may be concluded from the irregular and clandestine mode of their appointment, may not even have been admitted to holy orders; of which extreme case some instances are actually on record?

But even granting, that the clergyman, who appoints the substitute, may (as he conceives) have had sufficient proof of qualification, yet is he assuming a right, which does not belong to him; he is placing himself in the station of his bishop; he is violating the laws and canons of the church, to which

he has promised to submit himself; he is introducing confusion and misrule; and makes himself answerable, both to the church, and to the public, for whatever ill consequences may arise from his irregularity. In a word, in every case, in which a clergyman, entrusted by his bishop with a particular station, lets in another to discharge its duties, without having received the due and only lawful permission, the one party stands in the light of an usurper, and the other in that of an intruder. And, if such conduct be persevered in, it becomes imperative upon those, by whom the laws of the church are to be administered, to proceed with the due animadversion against both.

I have dwelt at greater length upon this particular point, not only because there is no irregularity more pregnant with evil to the church, than that of the clandestine admission of unlicensed persons to the discharge of clerical duties; but also, because, from the relaxed state of church discipline in this country, it is an irregularity which is but too prevalent amongst our clergy; and give me leave to add, that, perhaps, there is no diocese, in which it is more prevalent, than in that which I now address. For this there are many reasons; but the principal reason seems to be, that, for a considerable series of years, it had been the ill fortune of this diocese, from peculiar circumstances, to be deprived of the advantage of effective episcopal control: so that, with the exception of the administration of my predecessor, by whose prudent and firm attention to the regulation of the diocese, as much has been effected as could have been hoped for, within the space in which he presided over it; with this exception, I repeat, the discipline of this diocese may be said to have been totally neglected; whilst, in truth, in this diocese peculiarly, the discipline of the church requires to be most strictly enforced; and more especially, the point of discipline to which I have adverted, from the colluvial nature of the metropolis, which naturally collects adventurers of all professions, and in which a number of persons, who are no credit to their profession, are at all times likely to abound.

If, therefore, that rule, which the laws of the church strictly prescribe, and which my predecessor wisely enforced, should be attended to by me with minuteness, I trust, my reverend brethren, you will not consider me as doing more than what I conceive to be my bounden duty. And that you will, on your part, when you have well considered the propriety of the rule, as well as its strict legality, cheerfully co-operate with me in carrying it into complete execution, I can have no doubt; not only because it is binding upon every regularly appointed clergyman, by his oath of canonical obedience to his bishop, to obey willingly all his lawful orders; but also because I have experienced, since I came amongst you, the kindest and promptest desire, on all occasions, to comply with whatever I have proposed for the better regulation of our ecclesiastical concerns.

I have every confidence, my reverend brethren, that you will not consider my enforcement of this rule, as springing from any wish to exercise *authority*. This is not an exercise of authority: the whole is a mere discharge of duty:—the duty incumbent on you by the canons and laws of the church, and by the engagements by which you have bound yourselves, not being more obligatory than the duty incumbent on me, to see that this your duty be faithfully discharged: a duty indeed, on both sides, so great, so important, and influential, that if *it* be not discharged, all the other rules and regulations of the church become of little value. If there be no choice or selection of the ministers, who are to preach, and instruct, and administer the ordinances; if every ignorant and conceited person, who pronounces himself qualified to undertake the parochial ministry, may usurp the pulpit and the altar, it seems a matter of little consequence, whether the place of worship be the church or the conventicle; whether the self-appointed teacher, who breaks down and tramples upon the fences which circumscribe his order, has derived his qualification for such exercise of his functions from the college or the counter.

But, my reverend brethren, whilst, for these reasons, I

must (as I have said) enforce the rule, allow me at the same time to add, that there is no mode, by which I can prevent it from pressing inconveniently upon the parish minister, (whose duties, if he discharges them properly, are sufficiently laborious,) that I will not, on every occasion, be happy to adopt. It shall be my first business, as I feel it to be my bounden duty, to be at all times open to communicate with the clergy of the diocese. As I have urged it upon you, my brethren, to live continually among your respective flocks, so shall I deem it one of my first duties to live continually amongst you. On all occasions, it shall be my greatest pleasure to consult *with* you, and *for* you, in every difficulty; and as far as you will permit me, to act as your friend and adviser, whenever I can be of use. My chief desire will be, to be in contact and intercourse with you all. And as my only object in enforcing the rule to which I have particularly alluded, is to prevent improper and unqualified persons from occupying the stations which have been allotted to *you*, I shall be most anxious to assist you, by every means in my power, to provide proper substitutes, and even to provide them for you myself, when either your fair convenience, or health, or any other just cause may require it. I only expect of you, to deal openly, frankly, and honestly, with me; and it will be the dearest gratification of my heart, to deal kindly and affectionately by you.

There are other heads, on which I could wish to address you. But, I have gone to so great a length, on points which I deemed the most important at this time, that it will be necessary to reserve them for a future opportunity. The heads, to which I refer, concern the nature and laws of residence; the condition and number of parish churches; the qualifications and duties of churchwardens; the advantage resulting to the clergy from an acquaintance with the leading principles of ecclesiastical law; the great value of a perfect uniformity; the present state of parochial education, and the means of its improvement. On these various heads, many suggestions present themselves, but they must be postponed.

I shall only say at the present, that if a strict residence, coupled with a close spiritual superintendence, be not maintained by our clergy; if the churches be not kept in due repair, and new churches and chapels added when they may; if, for this purpose, the duties of churchwardens be not carefully enforced, and a reasonable attention to the laws of the church observed by the clergy; if the performance of the clerical duties be not conducted in strict accordance with the established rules; and, in addition to all, if the education of the young be not assiduously promoted, an education not of compromise or neutrality (which in truth is no education) but an education, religious and spiritual, and awakening;—the cause of the established church, and with it the cause of Christianity, will, in the natural course of things, be lost in this country; and nothing but the renovation of a Providential interference can possibly restore it.

There is one subject more, on which (although I am unwilling to offer any thing from this place, that may seem to relate to the mere *property* of the clergy) it is requisite that I should bestow a few words. The wisdom of the legislature has devised a plan, whereby, without disturbing the great principle of the system of the clergy's maintenance in this country, advantages are offered, which may render the operation of that system more convenient and satisfactory. A paternal government has devised this scheme, with a view to the joint accommodation of the clergy and the laity. And although those, who wish to subvert the property of the church, are willing to persuade the public, that no good can arise from the application of the law which has been passed upon this subject, yet it is manifest, that to the two great objections which have been raised by interested persons against the peculiar nature of the property of the church, (namely, the uncertainty of the tenure, and the inconvenience of collection,—difficulties, which, after the acquiescence of centuries, this sharp-sighted age has discovered to inhere in the system,) a direct and special remedy has been provided. That the clergy, then, will leave to those, whose desire to

invade their property makes it their interest to condemn every measure devised for its preservation, the task of opposing this law; and that they will both shew a rational regard for their own interests, and a grateful sense of the care bestowed upon those interests by the government, in forwarding, as far as in their power, the operation of the law, I do most confidently hope.

In having thus adverted to the property of the clergy, I feel it right to add, that I have not introduced a topic, altogether unsuited to this place. Because, with the independency conferred by the secure and deep-rooted tenure of their property, which the clergy of these lands enjoy, and which I trust they will never voluntarily relinquish, is essentially connected the independent discharge of their duty; which enables them to proceed without fear either of the great or of the many, in the onward course of their high calling; and which, next to the true Christian spirit that lifts above all, gives to them that tone and elevation, which raises them, if they be but faithful to themselves and to their great vocation, above every other body and description of clergy upon the face of the earth.

NOTES.

P. 444, line 19,—"The one possessing a church," &c.

PROTESTANTS, whose first principle it is, to hold the free use of Scripture to be essential to true religion, can never admit that to be true religion, which forbids the free use of Scripture: nor can they who build the entire profession of the Christian faith upon the word of God, concede the attribute of Christianity, in its vital character and in its proper sense, to a form of belief, which subjects the Word of God to the authority of man. The sentence in the charge, which is referred to in this note, has given offence. But as it only speaks the language of the REFORMATION, and merely gives in few words that which every *sincere* Protestant must maintain, it can offend only so far as *Protestantism* is itself an offence. It is painful to hurt the feelings of individuals. But it is impossible to compromise vital principles. And, that would be a severe state of things indeed, in which a protestant bishop should not dare to utter a protestant sentiment.

P. 445, line 1,—"Catholic church."

The members of the Romish communion deny to Protestants any participation in the CATHOLIC CHURCH. they exclude them altogether from its pale; and describe them formally as *heretics*. Nor is it only in set theological expositions of doctrine, that they express this demarcation; but in the daily use of the term CATHOLICS, as applied *exclusively* to themselves. This use of the term, from which offence might justly be taken, if the avowal of theological dogmas were to be made matter of offence, it would be not necessary to remark upon, were it not that Protestants have permitted themselves too frequently to adopt it. They, of course, cannot be supposed to apply the term in the sense in which it insults; but the best that can be said of such abuse of the term by *them*, is, that it flows from ignorance, and the slightest censure that can be passed upon it is, that it is a *vulgarism*. It should, however, be carefully remembered, that this use of the term by Protestants *seems* to imply an acquiescence in the unjustifiable assumption of the church of Rome; and is, in truth, employed as an argument in its support (and not an ineffective one) with the lower and more uninformed classes of that communion. It is therefore forced upon the Protestant clergy, as far as in their power, to disabuse the public on this head: more especially as parliamentary language, which from the influence of the daily press is sure to become the language of the multitude, has of late years familiarized the public ear to this injurious misapplication of the term: politicians, as such, too generally concerning themselves but little with the true distinctions of things, especially in matters of religion; and being for the most part satisfied, if they can enlist the public feeling in support of their favourite schemes of policy, or by any tone of temporary conciliation secure increased popularity to the party they espouse.

If it be said, that the appropriation

of the term here objected to is to be excused on the ground of *civility*, inasmuch as the denomination by which the members of the church of Rome were formerly described, as in reference to the head of that church, is now become offensive to that body, it is to be answered, first, that no civility can justify a falsehood, and that too upon a vital point of religion; and, in the next place, that there *is* a designation, which is not of an offensive character, and which is reconcileable with truth; the term *Roman Catholic*, which implies a *member of the Roman branch of the Catholic church*. This presents a just view of the case, inasmuch as our church, notwithstanding the corruptions of the church of Rome, does not deny to its members, that participation in the *Catholic pale*, which they refuse to us. The *peculiar tenets* of that church indeed we must reject, as not *Catholic;* not having been *universally received in the first ages of Christianity;* but still there are preserved in it, though mixed with rubbish and much tarnished, some of the sterling treasures of the church. Deeply is it to be lamented, that the members of that communion cling so to the dross with which these are encrusted, that they not only put it out of our power to embrace them as brethren of one common faith, but have the strange folly deliberately to deny *our* connexion with the Catholic Church of Christ; and the hardihood (almost ludicrous) to deny the lawful orders of *our* clergy.

Bishop Burnet, in speaking of the words of Cromwell, "I die in the Catholic faith," observes, "that the term *Catholic* was then used in England in its *true sense, in opposition to the novelties of the See of Rome.*" And Archbishop Cranmer uses these memorable words, "I agree, that that doctrine is *Catholic*, which was taught fifteen hundred years ago."

I recommend to the clergy a Sermon of the Rev. Vaughan Thomas, published in 1816, *on the impropriety of conceding the name of* CATHOLIC *to the Church of Rome, and its members, as a title of distinction.*

P. 450, line 9,—Enjoined in the 30th, 31st, 32nd, 33rd, 38th and 39th Canons.

CANON XXX.

Titles of such as are to be made Ministers.

No person shall be admitted into sacred orders, except he shall at that time exhibit to the bishop, of whom he desireth imposition of hands, a presentation of himself to some ecclesiastical preferment then void in that diocese; or shall bring to the said bishop *a true and undoubted certificate*, that either he is provided of some church within the said diocese where he may attend the cure of souls, or of some minister's place vacant, either in the cathedral church of that diocese, or in some other collegiate church therein also situate, where he may execute his ministry; or that he is a Senior Fellow of some college in the University; or except he be a Master of Arts of five years' standing, that liveth of his own charge in the University; or except by the bishop himself that doth ordain him minister, he be shortly after to be admitted either to some benefice or curateship then void, not to be removed until he be otherwise provided for, except by his notable evil carriage he deserve the contrary.

CANON XXXI.

The quality of such as are to be made Ministers.

No bishop shall hereafter admit any person into sacred orders, which is not of his own diocese; except he be a graduate of some university within the king's dominions; or except he shall bring letters dimissory (so termed) from the bishop of whose diocese he is; and desiring to be a deacon, is three-and-twenty years old, and to be a presbyter four-and-twenty years complete; and hath taken some degree of school in some of the universities; or at the least except he be able to yield an account of his faith in Latin, (according to the

articles of religion generally received in the church of England and Ireland,) and to confirm the same by sufficient testimonies out of the Holy Scriptures. And except moreover he shall then exhibit letters testimonial, or authentical certificate of his good life and conversation, under the seal of some college, where before he remained, or of three or four grave ministers, together with the subscription and testimony of other credible persons, who have known his life and behaviour, by the space of three years next before.

Canon XXXII.

The examination of such as are to be made Ministers.

The bishop, before he admits any person to holy orders, shall diligently examine him in the presence of those ministers that shall assist him at the imposition of hands: and if the said bishop have any lawful impediment, he shall cause the said ministers carefully to examine every person so to be ordered. Provided that they who shall assist the bishop in examining and laying on of hands, shall be of his cathedral church, if they may conveniently be had, or other sufficient preachers of the same diocese, to the number of three at the least. Neither shall any person be received in the ministry, nor admitted to any ecclesiastical living, nor permitted to preach, read, lecture, catechise, or minister the sacraments; except he shall first by subscription, declare his consent to the first four canons of this present synod, and every thing contained therein.

Canon XXXIII.

Caution for institution of Ministers into benefices.

No bishop shall institute any into a benefice, who hath been ordained by any other bishop, except he first shew unto him his letters of orders, and bring him a sufficient testimony of his former good life and behaviour, if the bishop shall require it; and lastly, shall appear upon the due examination to be worthy of his ministry.

Canon XXXVIII.

None to be Curates but allowed by the Bishop.

No curate or minister shall be permitted to serve in any place, *without examination, and trial first to be made of his sufficiency, sobriety, and fitness, every way for the ministration* whereunto he is deputed; paying respect to the greatness of the cure and meetness of the party. And *being found worthy, he should be admitted by the bishop of the diocese, in writing under his hand and seal.* And the said curates and ministers, *if they remove from one diocese to another, shall not be by any means admitted to serve, without testimony of the diocese, or ordinary of the place, as aforesaid, whence they come, in writing, of their honesty, ability, and conformity to the ecclesiastical laws of the church of Ireland.*

Canon XXXIX.

Strangers not admitted to preach without licence.

Neither the minister, churchwardens, or other officers of any parochial or collegiate church, shall *suffer any stranger to preach unto the people in their church, except they know him to be sufficiently authorized thereto, as is aforesaid.* And if any in his sermon, shall publish any doctrine either strange, or disagreeing from the word of God, or from the articles of religion generally received in the church of England and Ireland, they shall by their letters subscribed with some of their hands that hear him, so soon as may be, give notice of the same to the bishop of the diocese, that he may determine the matter, and take such order therein as he shall think convenient.

P. 451, line 8, from the bottom,—"The discipline of this diocese," &c.

It would be unjust to the memory of one of the most valuable and upright prelates of whom this country can boast,

the late Archbishop of Cashel, not to say, that all that it was possible for him to effect, in support of the discipline of the united diocese, was conscientiously discharged during the period of his *coadjutorship* in the archiepiscopal see. But, with the partial residence to which the nature of his situation necessarily confined him, and the contracted influence of his authority, occasioned by the separation of patronage from his deputed jurisdiction, it was not possible that he should accomplish all that the interests and regulation of the see required. That so much was actually accomplished, under circumstances so unfavourable, reflects credit not only upon that distinguished and lamented prelate, but upon the clergy of the diocese at large, on whom his virtues more than his authority must have operated either in the way of incitement or of restraint.

P. 453, line 20,—" Proper substitutes."

By these words are intended clergymen already licensed *in* the diocese, or such as shall be specially permitted to officiate by the diocesan, after inquiry into their titles and qualifications.

THE PRINCIPLE

OF THE

UNION

BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

IN

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITIES, EXPLAINED;

AND ITS

VALIDITY DEFENDED AGAINST THE FICTIONS OF WARBURTON,
AND THE USURPATIONS OF POPERY;

IN A

CHARGE

DELIVERED TO HIS CLERGY,

IN

ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN,

IN THE YEAR 1827.

A

CHARGE,

ETC.

It has happened, my reverend brethren, from various circumstances, that I have been prevented from personally holding a regular visitation of these dioceses, since I last addressed you from this place. Many events have occurred, within that period, deeply affecting the interests of the church, and many important topics connected with those events, press for observation. But there is one paramount subject, to which I would beg to draw your considerate and patient attention: a subject too, of a magnitude well suited to the present occasion, on which I have to express my sentiments, in the presence not only of my own clergy as Diocesan, but in that also of the synod of the entire province as Metropolitan.

At this day, when from causes which cannot be mistaken, and are indeed no longer concealed, clamours have been raised and reiterated against our national clergy; when false notions respecting the nature of our establishment are industriously and dishonestly circulated; when not only its efficiency, but its legitimacy, has been denied, so that even the very principle, which unites us with the state, has been brought in question; it may appear no inappropriate use of the present opportunity, to review the first principles of our church establishment, and to ascertain the grounds on which, as a portion of the church of Christ, of the true Catholic church, we stand connected with the state; as well as the

conditions which regulate, and the limits which define that connexion. We shall thus be the better able to expose the fallacies, which fraud would impose on ignorance to our detriment; and to deprive fanaticism, cupidity, and irreligion, of those false colours, under which they wage their unhallowed warfare against the established religion of the country.

Indeed, independently of such considerations, it cannot but be at all times important, that the principles of a union, whose consequences to the community must be vitally influential, should be thoroughly understood, and steadily kept in view, both by the clergy and the public. By the clear understanding of those principles it is, that the one will be enabled to see and preserve their true position in the state, and the other will be taught to value and defend that order of men, whose binding principle is the cement of the social polity, and whose civil existence is essentially interwoven, even for temporal purposes, with the best interests of the nation.

The ground of the union, of which we speak, is, happily for these lands in which our church is established, the same with that on which rests the stability of our civil fabric: and it is that, by which alone, in every state and country, unity and permanency can be secured to the system of government; namely, a *sovereign supremacy within the realm*, not to be interfered with by any extrinsic power, not to be resisted by any domestic impediment. This was the first great principle, which, at the dawn of the Reformation in these countries, was rescued from the encroachments of a power, which, by the joint agencies of fraud and force, had erected a visionary throne above the thrones of the most potent monarchs; had set conscience at its pleasure in array against allegiance; and by a magic and mystic influence, superseding all civil authorities wherever dispersed, had threatened to make that kingdom, which our Lord pronounced not to be of this world, one great ambitious monarchy commensurate with the world itself.

The great principle, which by the Reformation was rescued

from this corrupting domination, is one which it is equally incumbent on all to maintain in its present vigour. It is that, which alone can preserve the equilibrium of government: that which gives religion to the state, as the soul to the body: not a distinct power, which may clash, or if drawn into union may enter as an ally, with conflicting claims and privileges and checks; but a vitalizing spirit, pervading, and animating, and guiding, and tranquillizing, the whole community.

Nothing is more common with unreflecting minds, than to suppose a religious establishment, in its temporal character, as possessing an interest distinct from the state: a sort of incorporated craft, seeking its own ends, and working its own gains, through the power of its temporal associate.

This may indeed be the case, where the established religion is not embodied with the state; where it has a separate head from the state; or where (as sometimes happens) it acknowledges no human head, and claims an independent existence. But, where it rests upon the same supreme sovereignty with the state itself; where it and the state are but two different aspects of the same Christian community; where it is harmoniously associated with the state for the accomplishment of its highest purpose, the greatest happiness of the people; where it acts in such a manner as that it may be said to constitute the *conscience* of the state; there it is impossible, with any justness, to view its ministers as a body pursuing their own ends, and to be considered merely in their individual relations. Contemplated in their temporal capacity, they must be looked on as the instruments of the state, for its great objects; bound up in it for the public good; maintained by it on a public principle, and by means not left to individual option, even when made dependent on a revenue derived from individuals. Not like those, who have contracted with individuals, receiving a return as compensation for service done to the individual; but as discharging a great public duty, and deriving the return allotted by the state, from the allegiance which the subject owes to the sovereign

power and the laws, and not from the value which he may please to set on the individual advantage conferred.

And this view of the case, in truth, may, in direct opposition to one of the vulgarly prevailing errors of the day, reverse the proportion between the benefit derived by the individual from an established clergy, and his duty to contribute to their support; since the very persons, whose irreligious and immoral conduct and corrupting example, or whose unsettling opinions may lead them to reject the offices of an authorized Christian ministry, or tend to make those offices barren and ineffective, are the very persons, who render the invigorated and multiplied exertions of such a ministry the more necessary for the confirming those binding principles of civil union, which the antisocial and decomposing notions of such men would relax and dissolve; and therefore, they are eminently the very persons, on whom the increased burden of the more extended system of counteraction should principally press.

But, in the very outset of the subject, and before we are permitted to enter upon the character and consequences of an establishment, we are met with the position, that religion is a matter which belongs not to the civil magistrate: that it is a concern between the individual and his God, which comes not within the range of human institution: that, consequently, the very principle of a religious establishment is unsound: and that the civil magistrate has no right to exercise the powers of the state, either for its formation or support.

Yet surely it seems a strange thing to say, that there are any matters connected with the well-being of a state, over which the sovereign power of that state shall have no control. It seems a still stranger thing to assert, that in that which above all connects itself most materially with the well-being of the community, he, whose first duty it is to promote the welfare of that community, shall have no concern.

Man is a compounded being, not more impelled to seek his temporal advantage, than bound to pursue his eternal interests. Must not the state look to him in both conditions; and

as far as possible assist its individual members in the attainment of both? Is not the sovereign to rule for the greatest good of the whole? and can he leave out any part of that which constitutes their greatest good?

Is he not, again, bound by the duty which he owes to God, so to govern his people, as to enable them best to obey the will of the great common Sovereign of all? Must he not, then, secure for his subjects the best aids of religion? And does not the establishment of a national religion become a necessary branch of the duty of the sovereign, and an essential constituent of the well-being of the people? Is not, then, the rejection of it by a state, or a professed indifference as to its truth or falsehood, an open declaration, that human affairs may be conducted without any regard to Divine superintendence or authority, and that man may live without God in the world?

In truth, every separation of divine and human things is a rejection of Providence: it is an enslavement of all to human policy: it has been, and is from day to day, the cause of those wholesale departures from the principle of right, which go under the name of "reasons of state;" and which tend, by their pernicious example, to demoralize man and to disorganize society.

No state ought to exist, that sets Providence aside, and openly disregards divine things, or acts so as to subvert divine truths. Man cannot war against God, and God must rule over the kingdoms of men. Those that will not be the subjects of his sway, must be the objects of his vengeance. And such nations as prove themselves not the fit instruments for promoting his moral government of the world, must expect to be broken up, so soon as they have effected those temporal objects, for which Providence may have suffered them for a time to continue: which, amongst others, may possibly have been, the infliction of punishment on other guilty nations, which may demand for them a momentary display of power; or again, the open manifestation of their

own profligacy, to the clearer justification of the ways of God in his dealings with men.

I should not have dwelt so long upon so plain a proposition as that, which affirms it to be the duty of the sovereign to provide a *true* religion for his people, but that, strange as it may appear, it is a maxim, which hangs but loosely upon the minds of many at the present day: nay, even the contrary position is openly maintained by some, not only those who are avowed enemies to a religious establishment altogether, but by some who maintain its lawfulness and its necessity, upon grounds both of public duty and of religious obligation.

As to the former class, those who would separate the concerns of religion altogether from the state, and leave the nation without an established clergy, the examples which they present to the experience of mankind, in the instances of revolutionary France, and of the new governments of America, as well as (in a smaller sphere) of those ever varying and nondescript classes of nameless dissentients within the limits of our own country, which bring religion itself into disrepute:— these examples, I say, hold forth no such attractive spectacle of the benefits of the scheme of these national free-thinkers, as to demand any very particular consideration. These may be safely left for decision to the common sense of mankind, (which has been indeed already unequivocally pronounced upon them,) and to the bearing of the general propositions which have been, and of others which will be, advanced in this discourse.

But with respect to the latter class, those who admit the lawfulness and necessity of an Establishment, the matter becomes a subject of weighty consideration indeed. Error among these, on so essential a point as that with which we are concerned, is an enemy within the camp. This is, in the Psalmist's language, my own familiar friend, whose precious balms must not be allowed to break my head. On this part of the subject, therefore, I must intreat particular attention;

especially, as among those, whose erroneous opinion we are now about to examine, is to be ranked the name of a most distinguished prelate, whose talents and learning have secured to him so high a place amongst the theologians of our church, that it is little less than a duty to mark the errors, into which the enterprise of his genius, and the hardihood of his originality, have carried him on this, as they have done on some other subjects: and the more especially, as his theory has formed the chief standard of modern opinion upon the question before us; and, agreeably to the loose principles of the fashionable philosophy of the present day, has been turned to most mischievous account.

Some of my hearers will have anticipated me when I announce the name of *Warburton*, and refer particularly to his well known work on the alliance between church and state: a work, in which, whilst the author has vindicated in detail, by the most powerful arguments, the nature and character of the establishment of the Episcopal Reformed Religion in these countries, he has at the same time erected the system upon a principle, whose unsoundness admits of consequences, not only perilous to the establishment, but detrimental to the interests of religion itself.

The theory of this celebrated work is thus shortly described. Two independent societies are primarily supposed to exist, the one civil, the other religious: the care of the former extending only to the body and *its* concerns; and the care of the latter exclusively to that of the soul. Between these two independent societies an alliance is supposed to be formed by voluntary compact; in which the civil power affords protection to the religious, for the temporal benefit which it confers; it being always understood, that the end for which religion is established by the civil power, has *no connexion with religious truth*, but simply rests in *civil utility*.

Not to dwell upon this gratuitous notion of a *compact*, which cannot be affirmed ever to have had existence; it is, in the first place, to be observed, that the civil ruler is sup-

posed to have no regard for any but the lower and meaner concerns of his people, their mere temporal convenience: and, in the next place, that whilst to this end he allows religion to be essentially instrumental, as appears from the necessity he conceives of admitting it into alliance on that account, he yet feels no concern for the truth of the religion which he thus calls to his aid:—as if a false religion could work the temporal benefit of man equally with the true; that is, as if there were no difference between false and true religion in their influence on society; and that, in the concerns of this life, religion were altogether but a name: in direct opposition to the word of divine truth, which has assured us, that "godliness is profitable for all things, as well for the life that now is, as for that which is to come."

This view, it must be admitted, presents a complication of inconsistencies, too palpable to require much enlargement. These, whilst they mark the system to be unsound in its foundation, clearly illustrate the consequence of separating the primary concern of the sovereign from the provision of a religion for the people, and consequently from the provision of that which he deems to be a true religion.

The great fundamental error, which lies at the bottom of all these inconsistencies, is that which has been but too prevalent in later times; the substitution of policy for duty, of expediency for right. That association of the religious with the civil, which this prelate admits to be requisite for the great ends of society, he does not found upon the true principle, the duty of the magistrate; but on the fiction of a voluntary compact, whereby the church resigns her independence for protection. The learned prelate is here again met with difficulties, from which he cannot extricate his system. The church having primarily a distinct existence from the state, and at the same time possessing an influence over the mind, which if left to its unrestricted operation must constitute an imperium in imperio incompatible with the supreme sovereignty, it became unavoidable that the former should surrender its independency.

But then, in the first place, it becomes a question, whether independency be a right that any society can voluntarily surrender; especially a society, whose object is the care of human souls. And, in the next place, if that independence be surrendered for protection, what security is there for protection when that independence is gone? Besides, if the civil magistrate is to be perfectly indifferent as to the truth of the religion he adopts, how can a religious society safely surrender its independence to a power which, not regarding the soundness of the principles on which it is founded, may, from motives of temporary advantage, betray that religion to those who would subvert its principles?

Again, if the religious society is made absolutely dependent upon the civil, is it not then as much the creature of the civil, as if it had been the effect of its arbitrary formation? And what then becomes of the conditions of the supposed compact? There is no third power to mediate. It is of the essence of the sovereign will, to be above control. The religious society must be, as it were, absorbed into the system; no trace of an independent existence can remain, and the sovereign exercises his supremacy in matters ecclesiastical and civil, with equal authority.

It may be said, indeed, that if the single sovereignty, in all matters ecclesiastical and civil, thus ultimately grows out of this scheme of alliance, as completely, as if it had been founded in the principle of an original right in the sovereign to rule in both, it signifies nothing as to the conception of the mode: that the effect being equally secured, it is of no moment how it came to be produced. But in this there is a great mistake. The fixed ground of *right*, is necessarily a ground of *duty*. And therefore the sovereign, in the one case, is restrained in his choice by principles which look to religious truth; and in the other, as we have seen, is actually prevented from looking to the truth of the religion which he adopts, and must be governed only by his views of temporal advantage.

The learned prelate has, in the formation of his system,

acted as a politician, not as a theologian. Divines, we are told, make bad politicians. So, I trust, they ever will be found: if, to form a good politician, it be requisite to sacrifice any one of those great principles of right and truth, which no honest theologian can ever relinquish, upon any plea of expediency, or for any show of temporal advantage.

A system, such as that which we have considered, which avows a total indifference as to religious truth, and which must, of course, if followed up with perfect consistency, as readily adopt the cruel idolatries of Juggernaut, as the religion of Jesus Christ, provided thereby under peculiar circumstances temporal advantages were expected to be acquired;—would seem, in like manner, to release the subject from all religious obligation in his obedience. Religion being confessedly employed by the state, merely as the means of working its temporal ends, the subject must naturally feel his relation to the ruler as only of a temporal character, and to be governed solely by temporal considerations; unless, indeed, in opposition to the lesson taught him by the state, he adopts that standard of duty which the ruler rejects, and submits himself to the ordinances of man for the Lord's sake; thereby superadding the power of conscience to the penalty of the law, and converting the forced subjection of the slave into the willing submission of the subject.

And therefore the ruler is obliged, after all, to rely for the support of his authority upon the influence of that religious principle in his people, which he disclaims in himself; unless he be content to place his whole dependence upon fear, which is a weak defence of thrones; and to resolve all temporal power into force, which is a government for brutes, and not for men.

The learned prelate, indeed, it must be confessed, does not avowedly push his scheme to this extravagant extent. He observes, that though religion, or the care of the soul, be not within the province of the magistrate, yet this must always be understood with exception to the fundamental principles of natural religion;—namely, the Being of a God;

his Providence over human affairs; and the natural essential difference between moral good and evil.

These doctrines, he contends, it is of the office of the magistrate to cherish, protect, and propagate; and even to prevent all opposition to them, as he would the most flagrant offences against civil peace. Nor does this (he adds) at all contradict his general position, that the sole end of civil society is the conservation of body and goods; for that these lie at the very foundation of society, and the magistrate is concerned with their support, not as they promote our future happiness, but our present.

But it is to be feared that the learned prelate has here let in too much in the way of exception to his theory, or too little:—too much, if the civil magistrate is concerned, not with opinions, but with acts: too little, if there be other opinions fundamentally necessary to society as well as these. And, surely, it must be admitted of these very truths, that if they be necessary for the well-being of society, the right reception of them must be equally necessary. Now, how a right notion of God can be had but by a just conception of his attributes: how his Providence can be apprehended without a knowledge of his dealings with his creatures, and especially of his final treatment of them in a future state: and how good and evil can be usefully distinguished but by reference to some just rule of duty,—are matters not easy to be understood. And how, again, all these can be severally attained but by the teaching of divine revelation, it will be found not less difficult to comprehend.

And thus it seems to follow from what is conceded, that the civil magistrate has an essential concern in the right teaching of all these things; whether he chooses to pronounce of them, as regarded by him merely in reference to this world's goods, or in relation to those higher objects for which the goods of this world can alone be valued: whether he chooses to depreciate and degrade them, as seeking them only for his own ends; or to exalt them to their true place, by referring them to that higher destination, for which both he and they were designed.

Thus, then, it appears, that with the erroneous principle, that would confine the care of the magistrate to matters which affect the body, inconsistencies and contradictions are inseparably linked; whilst the author who maintains this, contends for an alliance with the principle of religion, without which, it is agreed on all hands that no society of men can continue.

On the foundation of the distinct provinces of the civil and the religious societies, many have been disposed to build with Bishop Warburton, who at the same time contend, that his doctrine of an alliance between these is totally unfounded; and who avail themselves of the various inconsistencies in his scheme, to show that no such alliance can subsist. Of these, the most prominent is a lay writer of the communion of the Church of Rome, who condemns, in the strongest terms, the position, that the church can resign her independency to the civil power, and make the magistrate the supreme head. Mutual concessions between the church and state he holds to be impossible: and, at the same time, he contends, that the independence of the Christian church is derived from a higher source than that which the state can claim as the origin of its rights, the one flowing immediately from mere human authority, and the other deriving its origin from a divine right.

In asserting this principle, this writer is joined by those who are most opposed to the religious scheme which he defends; and both the Church of Rome, and the Church of Geneva, have built upon the common ground, that the civil magistrate can have no interference in the concerns of the church; that the source of its authority is placed beyond all human reach: and therefore the supremacy of the civil magistrate, as established in the Church of England, is alike resisted by both; and the Independent and the Romanist are sure to make common cause in every case in which that supremacy is concerned.

At the same time it must be remembered, that this union against the Church of England springs from principles directly opposed to each other, in the two combining parties:

the one denying that the church can be subject to any head whatever, the other contending that the whole church of Christ has been made subject to one human governor;—if human, indeed, he can be called, who is held to be the vicegerent of Christ in the government of his church, and is looked to by the great majority of his followers as clothed with the infallibility that belongs to Christ himself. So that were the Church of England withdrawn from the intermediate space which it occupies between these two incongruous leaguers, so as to permit the immediate collision of their peculiar principles, their mutual opposition must be marked by stronger characters of repulsion than those which animate either against that church at the present day. They, who now deny the lawfulness of allegiance to a supreme human authority in matters ecclesiastical, must be in that event required, not only to admit that allegiance, but to devote it to a foreign functionary; that functionary, of an order, too, which they condemn as an unscriptural abomination; and yet, who, in virtue of that very order, would claim authority by divine right over their church.

But it becomes necessary to consider, upon what ground it is, that they, who deny that religion falls within the jurisdiction of the civil ruler, maintain that denial.

It is urged, in the first place, that if religion be the proper concern of the civil ruler, there is nothing to prevent it, in that case, from devolving upon him entirely, so that the care of souls should come within his immediate province. And, in the next place, it is contended, that there can be nothing to prevent him from feeling himself authorized to impose upon his people whatever religion he may think proper to prescribe. And thus, it is said, the civil ruler may consider himself empowered, not only to assume the spiritual functions, but, for the propagation of that religion which he deems to be true, to exercise a spiritual dominion over the consciences of his subjects.

But, the very religion which the ruler is bound to support, —I speak here of the Christian ruler, of course, with no

other have we any concern,—that very religion debars him from the assumption of such powers. His authority is at the same time his restraint. The Christian governor has no right to prescribe against the known law of God, contained in his written word. And that very law, which has proclaimed, that "kings shall be the nursing fathers, and queens the nursing mothers" of his church; that they are to protect and cherish it with the supreme powers with which they are invested;—has pronounced, that it is *His* church, to which they are to afford their fostering aid; that it is as supreme *temporal* rulers, they are to minister support; and that it is to the religion which God's word prescribes, *that* support is to be supplied.

The sovereign, then, is in the very first instance withheld from the exercise of functions purely spiritual; because these are, by the divine authority, conferred upon an order of men, set apart, by a special commission from our Lord himself, to preach his religion, and to administer his sacraments; a commission, which not only conferred those powers on his first chosen followers, but secured their transmission to an authorized ministry, by a legitimate succession, throughout all the ages of his church. From the exercise of these functions, then, or the bestowing the capacity to exercise them, the sovereign is restrained. This is matter of divine institution. The civil magistrate can neither confer, nor exercise, the sacred function. To him belongs not the power of order. He can neither execute, nor qualify any to execute, the ministration of the word and the sacraments. He cannot change any thing which God's law has clearly determined and prescribed. All those spiritual functions, in a word, which were possessed by the Apostles, and by those whom they commissioned, are withheld by the divine appointment from the jurisdiction of the sovereign, and confined to that class of men whom God ordained to succeed them in his church. These are from a commission higher than human, and therefore no human power can be permitted to usurp them.

Again, on the same principle by which the sovereign is

restrained from assuming to himself the exercise of spiritual functions, he is likewise restrained in his choice amongst the various descriptions of those by whom they are exercised, as to whom he should appoint as the authorized religious teachers of his people.

And, first, it is manifest, that as he cannot prescribe against the known laws of God, so he cannot prescribe in favour of a system that goes against those laws: he cannot prescribe in favour of a system that shuts out the revealed word of God, whereby those laws are made known: he cannot prescribe in favour of a system, that will not be judged by that word, or (which is the same thing) that will not be judged by it, in any interpretation but that which it arbitrarily imposes on it itself. The sacred Scripture, the charter of the Christian faith, supplies that great public standard of the laws and will of God, to which both prince and people throughout the whole Christian world must refer for their appropriate duties. Since infallibility belongs not to man, and is the attribute of omniscience alone, the magistrate may not always be so fully assured that the form of religion, which appears to his judgment to agree with this standard, is so correct a transcript, as that he should feel himself unqualifiedly authorized to prescribe it to his people: but of this he must be certain, that he *cannot* prescribe to his people a form which rejects or nullifies that standard. He may not perhaps hold himself justified in all cases to enjoin a religion which he deems to be true; but he is clearly not at liberty to employ, for the instruction of his people, a form which is false:—which every form manifestly is, that forbids, or impedes, or discourages the free perusal of the *written word of God.* In human affairs, the legislator, who would debar his people from free access to the written laws which had been framed for their guidance, under the pretence that they might not rightly understand them, or under *any* pretence, would be considered as an intolerant tyrant, to whose yoke it was impossible to submit. What, then, must be thought of that legislator, who in matters of everlasting moment, would obstruct his people

in the examination of the written record of those higher laws, by which their final destiny was to be fixed; and who, in the great charter of salvation, would exercise a power, which, were he to exercise it on the charter of Runnymede, would arm against him every free spirit, as a despotism not to be endured.

Again, the sovereign cannot (at least he cannot consistently) prescribe in favour of a system, the nature, and extent, and limits of which are not made known and unequivocally defined. It being his duty, to the utmost of his power, to secure to his people the teaching of religious truth, it, of course, becomes his duty to be fully apprized of that, which is to be taught *as* truth. A system, which either rejects the idea of a fixed creed, or contains within it a principle of indefinite variation, cannot be adopted without incurring the risk of adopting what it might become the duty of the state to discard, and thus laying the foundation of religious conflict and general confusion. The Scripture itself, although it comprises all truth necessary to salvation, yet does not comprise it in the form of one connected scheme, all whose lines and boundaries are plainly presented to the view. The rays of the divine light are left to be collected by the honest industry of man; and the highest praise was bestowed by the inspired teacher of Christianity, on those who diligently searched the Scripture to discover what was true. Those, then, who, on the one hand, affect to refer to Scripture itself, as their only creed; and those who, on the other, pretend to additional lights through the medium of tradition, are alike open to the objection of an unsettled form of faith; and the Independent and the Romanist are, on this ground, equally unfitted to be the spiritual associate of the enlightened Christian ruler, who would provide for his people a fixed religious code, applicable to the purpose of general instruction, and of whose conformity with the revealed truth of God he might, at all times, satisfactorily assure himself, by a comparison with his sacred word.

It may sound extraordinary to some, that the last named

church, whose perpetual boast is the unity and immutability of its faith, should be joined with the various classes of Independents and nondescript dissentients, in the charge of an unsettled creed. But the truth is, that after all its display of councils, canons, catechisms, and decretals; after all its pomp and pretension; the religion of Rome is still undefined. Its doctrines have continually changed with time and place. There is no variety of opinion or sect that has not had shelter and nutriment within its rank and capacious enclosure; and up to this very day, it cannot be said to have acquired any settled form of doctrine. Its nature indeed admits of indefinite variation, there being no fixed standard by which it is to be adjusted. Scripture supplies none, inasmuch as that is to be received only as the church interprets it: and therefore all must vary at the pleasure of the church. So that the state knows not what it embraces, when it accepts the religion of Rome as its spiritual rule: for then, in truth, it accepts the indefinite and arbitrary will of the church, and that church (truth compels me to add) both unscriptural and corrupt. One thing, however, it is sure to embrace, *a foreign ecclesiastical supremacy, clothing itself with infallibility, and excluding all from the possibility of salvation who refuse to submit to its jurisdiction.* This part of the system is sure to be found unchanged, although every other peculiar doctrine of that church were abandoned.

Again, the sovereign cannot prescribe in favour of an *intolerant* religion. He cannot prescribe in favour of a religion, that denies the right of private judgment, and that exercises a dominion over conscience. Being bound to employ a free judgment upon the written word of God, in order to ascertain that what he proposes for the instruction of his people is not inconsistent with that word, he cannot deny to them the same freedom of inquiry. The law of God is itself the law of liberty. He will there find nothing to coerce conscience. An early Father has said, "it belongs not to religion to force religion." The language of the gospel more powerfully proclaims the same. The sovereign, who obeys

the Christian law, cannot establish a religion which maintains the contrary. Such a religion he must know not to be the religion of the gospel. And therefore every form of religious belief, that contains within it principles subversive of the right of private judgment, he must disclaim as an auxiliary of the state. On the ground of religious liberty, he must indeed grant, even to this intolerant system, toleration. But that toleration must never grow to power: for then toleration to one becomes intolerance to all. The principles, it is manifest, that are most directly subversive of religious freedom, are those by which a church claims for itself the possession of infallible authority, and exclusive salvation. And in degree as any church approaches to these unscriptural and arrogant assumptions, it becomes proportionally intolerant and persecuting. The doctrine of infallibility shuts out doubt, and extinguishes inquiry; whilst from the belief that out of the particular communion there is no salvation, not only is the adherent of that faith bound to cling to it with a blind and desperate fidelity; but, if he be influenced by an ardent love for his fellow creatures, he is impelled by humanity itself to force others, by whatever means, within its pale. With the salvation of immortal souls in view, is it wonderful, that a church characterized by the unqualified influence of these tenets, should be led to reject toleration from its creed; that proselytism should be ranked amongst its highest duties; and persecution, if necessary for that purpose, be classed amongst its greatest acts of charity. It is manifest, then, that against principles of such tendency, as warring not only against religious freedom and scripture truth, but as destructive of the peace of society itself, the sovereign is bound peculiarly to protect his people.

Again, the sovereign cannot prescribe in favour of a system, that maintains a spiritual supremacy independent of civil government: because he cannot establish a supremacy above his own. This involves a contradiction in terms; for then his supremacy would no longer exist, and he ceases in truth to be sovereign. It is a vain thing to attempt to distinguish

between spiritual and temporal, in the case of sovereign power. There can be but one sovereign in any state: and he whose jurisdiction is of divine right, and whose empire is over conscience, is the true sovereign, let the creature of mere civil convention assume what name he may. The civil governor may, indeed, exert his temporal power in support of his authority; but where the two jurisdictions clash, the moral influence of that which claims a divine original, will ultimately prevail. There can be no twofold allegiance. There may be an external homage; the homage paid to power, so long as it predominates: but the true homage, the homage of the heart and will, must cleave to that by which the movements of the heart are governed: and the paramount allegiance must be felt due to that authority, which is supposed to be, by a divine right, entitled to allegiance from the sovereign himself.

Indeed, respecting such a system as this, one great difficulty seems to be, that to the sovereign is not left the liberty to judge, whether it shall be established or not. It assumes the inherent right to establish itself in every country. It is, by authority more than human, essentially supreme in spiritual matters over all. Both prince and people are bound to submit to its mandates, as the mandates of the great head of the Christian church; and they, who refuse to do so, are rebels against a rightful sovereignty. All are, in truth and reality, the subjects of its sway, whether they will acknowledge it or not. Now, as this, wherever it gains admission, must demand to govern by its own laws, and exercise its own jurisdiction, disclaiming, either in its introduction or in its continuance, all dependence on the state; and rejecting all alliance with it, or connexion with its concerns, except so far as it may be enabled to employ the powers of the state for its own objects: it is manifestly the wisdom of the sovereign (if he would retain his sovereignty) to prevent the introduction of such a system within the range of his jurisdiction, by every means within his power. It must present itself,

wherever it is received, not as an ally, but as a principal: its office must be, not to assist, but to command.

These are matters, in which we are not left to speculation, or general reasoning, for the result. Of the mischievous influence of such a system, when brought fairly into operation, all Christendom has for ages had woful experience: and the degree to which the doctrine of a universal spiritual supremacy, founded in divine right, is likely to mix itself with the temporal concerns of nations, may be sufficiently estimated by the frequency, with which the power to exercise authority over kings themselves, has been claimed upon that principle, even to the releasing the subjects from their civil allegiance and to the deposition of the sovereign. What, in truth, do we find the history of Christian Europe, during the period in which that principle was openly upheld to its full extent, but a history of wars and cruelties, springing from its ecclesiastical and temporal usurpations, and from the resistance necessarily made to its ambitious and unceasing encroachments? And, even in later times, since the Reformation has checked the presumption and reduced the strength of that antichristian power which had so long disturbed the peace of Europe, what do we find to be the chief cause of unquiet in the states of Christendom, but that restless spirit of intrusion and usurpation, which the same principle everywhere produces, from its insatiable desire of ascendancy and rule? What, particularly in these highly-favoured countries, on which Providence has bestowed so many blessings, and, above all, the blessing of a true religion acknowledged by the state; what do we find at this day to be the chief source of the distresses and dissensions which tend so powerfully to mar those blessings, but the workings of that same spirit, which will suffer nothing near it to be at rest; which inflicts on every established institution the necessity of continual self-defence; which allows to the state itself no peace; by the operation of which, acting upon the multitudes which it hourly inflames, the laws are trampled under foot; the sove-

reign authority brought into contempt; and the ministers of every religion, that respects the Bible and refuses subjection to a foreign head, persecuted and hunted down, as the pests of society; until at length it has become the familiar cry with the actors in this system, and their abettors, that *the Protestant religion is a curse!*

Now, monstrous as all this appears, yet does it not naturally flow from the principles, gravely maintained, and triumphantly asserted, in support of this system? If it possesses an inherent right to be established in every country, what can it want but sufficient power to place it there at all times? In what light can any other religion adopted by the state be viewed, but as an usurpation, and its ministers as usurpers? Can they, in truth, be considered as *Christian ministers?* They have not had the *mission*, which alone can give them a title to act as such. There is but one church. Or at least there is one, that is sovereign over all others that assume the name. The Head of that one church is supreme over all: and from that Head alone can any ecclesiastical jurisdiction be derived. Before this great ecclesiastical supremacy, the prerogatives of the rightful sovereign, touching all matters ecclesiastical, vanish in every country. He can bestow no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The ecclesiastical functionaries of the state are derided, as exhibiting in the discharge of their spiritual duties, a burlesque on the true pastors of the only true church. They want the legitimate mission. They want the Divine imprimatur. Their spiritual and ecclesiastical faculties are the mere figment of an act of parliament. Their whole order is but a fiction of law. And the ecclesiastic of foreign character, who bears the commission of a foreign priest, and who is permitted to act under that commission, only by the toleration of the power that he insults, holds himself authorized by the system which he supports, openly to rebuke the sovereign and the state, in the persons of their lawfully appointed ministers, by denying to them all right of spiritual jurisdiction; insolently to

demand of them, in amplification of the words of an early father, addressed to the heretics who had usurped the possessions and the offices of the true catholics,—"who they are? from whence they came? from what heaven they fell? what earth has produced them?"—and thus presumptuously, and on the ground of undoubted right derived from a foreign power, to assert his privilege to overturn the instituted orders of the state, to unpriest the clergy of the land, to shoulder the bishop from his cathedral, and the sovereign from his throne!

This, indeed, were it merely the act of individual arrogance and folly, might be passed over without notice, either of the individual or the act. It might be viewed and dismissed, as the ravings of a personal vanity. But when, in truth, it is but an indiscretion in the individual, revealing the familiar feeling and the established doctrines of a body, in avowal of the essential principles of a system, built upon the tenet of the universal supremacy of which we treat, what follows, but that, if the rights of the sovereign, the peace and safety of the community, and the respectability and usefulness and privileges of the orders of the clergy established by the state, are to be protected, every exertion must be made, and that without delay, to counteract the turbulent and encroaching spirit, and to control and subdue the unconstitutional workings, of so domineering, so hostile, and so subversive a system?

In truth, ascendancy must, at all times, and in all places, be the object, as it is affirmed to be the right, of such a system. And as the ascendant must be decidedly either with the sovereign or the system, it behoves the sovereign to be always vigilant, to treat such a system as its particular nature imperatively demands. This at least is manifest, that such a system can never be safely or consistently adopted by the sovereign, as his acknowledged scheme of national religion: for, if so adopted, not only must it exercise, in virtue of its paramount rights, a dominion over the sovereign, but

also over every differing profession of religious faith that may arise amongst his subjects, so as, by its despotic rule, finally to extinguish either the creed, or its professors.

Thus, we have seen, that the sovereign is not, in virtue of his ecclesiastical supremacy, empowered to prescribe to his people, arbitrarily, whatever religion he may please; any more than, in virtue of his civil supremacy, he is entitled to impose whatever laws he may think proper. In both, he must be governed by the laws of reason and of God; and he cannot legitimately enact any thing contrary to what those laws enjoin. He cannot therefore, as we have seen, take to himself the right to exercise or to confer spiritual functions: nor can he adopt for his people a religious system, which labours under any of the disqualifications which have been enumerated. He cannot adopt a system which presents no defined and settled form of doctrine and belief: nor can he adopt a system, which asserts a supremacy over scripture, over conscience, or over the sovereign himself. Much less can he adopt a system, which asserts a supremacy over all; and still more a supremacy founded in DIVINE RIGHT, which no human authority is entitled to question.

It is not, my brethren, too much to say, that the form of religion, with which we stand immediately connected, presents a system which is happily free from all these disqualifications: whilst it cannot be denied, that the popular creed, against whose errors we have been specially commissioned to guard, and whose encroachments we are hourly challenged to repel, is not only subject to them all, but embodies them in its very essence, and pronounces those to be without the pale of the catholic faith, who do not submit themselves to the supreme authority, which declares them to be binding upon all.

The Church of England and Ireland presents herself under characters the opposite of those that have been named. She presents herself as *Scriptural*, as *Catholic*, as *Tolerant*, as *Social*, as *Loyal*, and as *Protestant*. She presents, in her Articles, her Creeds, and her Liturgy, a settled and defined

scheme of *doctrine* and *worship;* for the spiritual nature and authority of which she refers and invites her followers to the free examination of the Sacred word. And for her *discipline*, she refers to her Canons, which are few and plain.

Again, the Church of England and Ireland presents herself as *Catholic*. She pretends not to be exclusively the Church of Christ, out of whose pale there can be no salvation. This presumption, in whatever church it exists, she rejects on the contrary as *un*-Catholic. Whatever community of professing Christians holds the *essentials* of the Christian religion, she considers to be a branch of the Church of Christ. To all such she is ready to give the right hand of fellowship; and for such she continually offers up her petitions to the throne of Grace; praying daily "for the good estate of the Catholic," or universal Christian "Church;" however the parts of that church may differ from her as to that external form of government which she deems to be *Apostolical;* and which she has thought it her duty to adopt, as agreeing to the exemplar of the primitive Church of Christ; or rather, which she holds as an unbroken continuation of that church.

The Church of England and Ireland also presents herself as *Tolerant*. Built upon the sound fundamental principles of Protestantism; respecting the rights of conscience; assuming to herself no power to control the judgment of those who differ from her doctrines, no divine right to compel obedience to her dogmas; that church would act with great inconsistency indeed, if she refused toleration to those who cannot conscientiously conform to her discipline and worship. Not holding the *exclusive doctrine*, that none are to be saved who are without the pale of her communion, *intolerance* in *her* would want even the appearance of excuse. It would be a wanton violation of her own principles, a direct contradiction of her whole character. The advocates, indeed, of that exclusive doctrine which she rejects, supply the most decisive attestation to the perfect and practical toleration of her principles, in the very reproaches which they bring

against her, for the great variety of sects which have grown up beneath her shelter: an evil, whatever it may be, which the coercive system, opposed to Protestantism, is enabled, by a very summary process, effectually to correct.

To this tolerant character of the Church of England, the existence of the Test laws, and the political disabilities of the adherents of the Pope, are opposed, as vital objections. But this arises from a gross perversion of ideas upon the subject. The evil of test laws (as far as it is an evil) may be urged as an argument against the principle of an establishment; but this principle being once admitted, their existence is well known to those who have considered the subject, to be the result of a toleration rather than a denial of it. The single fact, that in those countries in which there is no toleration there are no test laws, may supply a short argument upon this head. Intolerance needs them not. It has more compendious modes of self-protection. And as to the political disabilities attached to popery in these islands; if they be considered, as they are in truth, not *penal* but *defensive;* if the subjects of them may reasonably be viewed as the imposers; then the point of intolerance is out of the question.

But let these things be as they may, the church, it should always be remembered has, strictly speaking, no concern in the case. These things are matter of political enactment, which belongs not to the church, but to the state; and with which as a church, she has no more connexion, and for which she is liable to no more responsibility, than her enemies are willing to attribute to her, in those other acts of the legislature, whereby powers have been given to *them*, that may be turned to *her* detriment.

If, indeed, in the first days of the Reformation, during the perilous struggles of those glorious divines and martyrs, who laboured to rescue the *Catholic* Church from the despotism and corruptions of the *Roman*, some acts are discoverable, which *appear* to connect our church immediately with intolerance, it must be remembered, that the long reign of popery

had rendered Europe so familiar with the idea of persecution *for the sake of religion*, that it is not to be wondered that some vestige of this sad corruption of Christianity should have lingered with others, from which those most excellent of men, reared as they had been in all the errors of popery, were not able at once to effect their perfect emancipation. But, from the time when the Church of England became fully released from this antichristian influence, and when she had assumed her true form, adjusted to the sound scriptural principles on which she was founded, what do we find in the language in which she gives her sense of the Christian doctrines, in the spirit which pervades her formularies, or in the temper which has distinguished all her genuine sons and followers, but the truest toleration, and the most Christian charity?

As to the form of expression which occurs in one of the creeds which she inherits from the ancient catholic church, and which is objected against her, as inconsistent with the character of toleration which she claims, it should be recollected, that this she holds in common with almost all the Christian world at the present day: and in doing so, but continues that which has been maintained in the Christian church for thirteen hundred years: that this, of course, tends not to claim salvation exclusively for *her own* communion; that, in truth, in substance it shuts out no Christians from the covenanted mercies of God, who acknowledge the divinity and incarnation of Christ and his redemption; and that when understood as it is intended, and explained by the articles presenting the true doctrine of the church,—one of which pronounces this creed to be catholic because it is scriptural, and another declares the judgment of no church to be infallible,—it amounts to little more than directing the sixteenth chapter of the gospel of St. Mark to be read in the congregation, in which chapter the words of our Lord are contained, which declare, that he that believeth not, cannot be saved.

The single instance, then, deserving consideration, that can, or ever has been, urged against the tolerant spirit of

our church, is this,—that it declares, in common with the primitive catholic church, that it holds certain words of our Saviour respecting salvation to be true; and that it believes, that, in common with that church, it has given the true meaning to those words; at the same time acknowledging, that, in that acceptation of the words, it is, as every church must be, liable to error. This of course is scoffed at by the church which *never can be wrong*. But this is the full amount of our intolerance. And therefore I feel that I stand on firm ground, in repeating what I have before said, that tolerance is, and is in fact conceded by our adversaries to be, an eminent attribute of our church.

Again, the Church of England and Ireland presents herself as *social;* that is, as adapted to the rational and legitimate intercourses and objects of the social system. Her ministers employ no artificial contrivances to gain an ascendant power over the minds of the multitude, which might be turned at their pleasure against the welfare of the community. No practices on superstition. No juggling pretences to miracles. No spiritual right assumed, to discover all the secrets of their people, joined to the religious obligation superseding all the ties of sworn allegiance, to conceal from all mankind the secrets so intrusted, even though they affect the safety of the sovereign, and the existence of the state. No dependence upon any human authority, either in temporals or spirituals, that is not itself dependent on the supreme authority of the state. No principles of a dissocial nature, that can tend to give to the church a *distinct* interest from that of the community at large. No abstraction, by means of a forced celibacy, or monastic aggregation, from the natural ties of allegiance and mutual charity, withdrawing the entire body of the clergy from those influences, which bind men together as good subjects of the commonwealth. No secret mysterious connexion forming an extended ecclesiastical corporation, pervading different and distant countries, and enabling it to carry on its schemes of separate aggrandizement, by a confederation unknown, and too generally

hostile to the state. No secrets, in short; no craft of any kind in our religion, either as affecting the state or the individual. The Bible contains our secrets. We put into the hands of all, the very book, from which we derive the religion which we teach; and we enable, and indeed require, all to judge for themselves, whether what we teach be the doctrine of the revealed word of God. Whether, then, the principles, which regulate the social intercourses of our ecclesiastical system, be such as to promote or to disturb the harmony of social order, it is in the power of all men to decide.

Again, the Church of England and Ireland presents herself as *loyal*. Her allegiance is undivided. No nice distinctions, in the submission due to the sovereign, as to *spirituals* and *temporals*. No difficulty in discovering the fine and shifting line, that is to mark the boundary between the obedience to be given to the prince, and that which is to be reserved for some other power. Our church is explicit in declaring, that the Christian religion allows the prince to "rule all estates and degrees committed to his charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and to restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers" of all descriptions, whether they be of a spiritual, or of a merely temporal character. Desirous to lay the foundation deep, of cheerful submission to the sovereign, the magistrates, and the laws, she is studious to imprint on early childhood the valuable lesson "to honour and obey the king, and all that are put in authority under him; to submit themselves to all their governors, to order themselves lowly and reverently to all their betters, and to do their duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call them." This lesson, which is early taught and late inculcated, is also without reserve or qualification: the spirit of obedience to the king, and to the laws, *universally* enforced, without reference to any ecclesiastical authority, to learn in what cases that obedience may be conscientiously withheld.

Again, in the daily service of our church, prayers are offered up for the welfare of the sovereign, both temporal and

eternal; whilst "we and all his subjects" are reminded of our obligation "faithfully to serve, honour, and humbly obey him;" and the monarch at the same time kept in recollection that his authority is derived from the King of kings, and is given to him for the great ends of promoting the glory of God, and the happiness of his people: and, that he may employ his authority for these ends, is made the subject of a special petition from his people.

Again, it must be particularly observed, that our church does not regulate her petitions for her civil rulers by caprice, by worldly policy, or by party zeal; but by the word of God. Whatever be *their* character or conduct, *hers* is uniformly dutiful, and loyal; making prayers and supplications for those in authority, that "we may lead peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty." She points out to men of the world their path of duty; and then leaves them to manage it without her interference. She meddles not with the politics of the day, nor troubles herself about abstract questions respecting civil compacts between the prince and the people, nor about their respective privileges under the various forms of government that may exist, but satisfies herself with the simple facts as they rest upon apostolic authority, that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that subjects are to "submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake."

Does this justify the vulgar objection, that the established church is a political engine, and that her clergy are the hired mercenaries of the state? Inculcating, as they do, the principles of loyalty on the grounds of scripture, they render an essential service not more to the government than to the community at large, and were they even of no other use, they would in this be a public blessing.

Should they indeed, although in defence of what was right, follow the unhappy example which has been set them, of using their ministerial influence to fan the flame of political animosity: should the sanctity of the pulpit be turned into the faction of the forum; should the walls of the church be

made to echo the jarring notes of bigotry, prejudice, and strife, instead of resounding with "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men;"—then, it must be admitted, they would lose sight of their sacred character, and perform an odious part, one neither required by the state, nor sanctioned by the church.

Again, the Church of England and Ireland presents herself as *protestant*. This is her primary character, and as such she has been adopted and established by the state. Maintaining the paramount authority of Scripture, the right of private judgment, and the supremacy of the sovereign, in opposition to the church of Rome, which held and imposed tenets in direct contradiction to all; she abjured the fundamental errors and despotism of that church, and with them the multiplied corruptions and abuses which these had engendered; and so having purified herself from the accumulated dross of superstition, and having restored religion to its true and ancient catholic standard, she became worthy of adoption by a government that had resolved to break the chain of spiritual slavery, and to give the blessings of a pure religion to a free and enlightened people. The protestant principle, then, being the covenanted ground of the establishment of our church, so must that principle remain the unbroken condition of her tenure.

We are told, indeed, that the established church of England and Ireland differs but little, at the present day, from the church of Rome. If that be the case, and if it be also true that the religion and principles of the church of Rome are immutable, then must our church have changed her character, then is she no longer the true guardian of religious freedom and scripture truth; she has violated the conditions, upon which she was incorporated with the free constitution of this realm; and she is no longer entitled to hold the place which has been allotted to her in conjunction with the state.

But thanks be to the great Ruler of all, there never was a time, and especially in this part of the empire, in which so degrading an imputation was less deserved. The true spirit of

the protestant religion is alive, progressive, and, with the blessing of God, will be triumphant. The numerical mass of a population shut out from the light of the revealed word of God, may for a time present obstacles to this consummation, but the clouds of ignorance and gross error will pass away, and the sun of righteousness and truth will spread his beams throughout the land.

But what are the respects in which our church agrees with the church of Rome? In truth they have scarcely a single point of agreement in any thing that can be justly deemed essential to religion. Nor do they, at this moment, notwithstanding the interested and unfounded declaration of some who have an object in the misrepresentation, approach nearer to accordance, than they did at the time of their original separation.

It is admitted, on all hands, that the two churches differ, as they have at all times differed, as to the rule of faith: the one building solely on the scripture of God, the other adding to it, or rather erecting above it, the tradition of man; thereby rendering the word of God of none effect; and overlaying the true foundation with the rubbish and superstition of ages: so that, in reality, the older the religion of tradition becomes, the farther it must be removed from the truth, and the more real religion must be buried and hid from the view.

Again, they differ, as they have at all times differed, as to the mode of discovering what true religion is: the one forbidding the exercise of the judgment of the individual, as it would forbid a *crime*, and requiring him to regulate his religious principles by a judgment different from his own; and the other referring each man to his own judgment and his own conscience, honestly directed to the best means of instruction, in the word of life, and thereby attaching to each his own responsibility: so that, by the one, religion is made (as it truly is) a matter between man and his God; and, by the other, it is rendered a concern between man and his church, insomuch that all responsibility is transferred, and all blame removed. Lest this, which in its own nature appears so

monstrous, should be considered as an unfair deduction from the general principle, I must, though I have occupied so large a portion of your time already, request your attention to an authorized exposition on this subject, which is at this day inculcated upon every Roman catholic student in divinity, as enabling him to convey to the people, entrusted to his pastoral care a just view of the relative condition of the protestant and the catholic (as they choose to call him) at the day of judgment.

"The *Protestant*, when called to judgment, will appear provided with no other aid than *his own private judgment*, with which he searched the Scriptures, and proved the articles of his creed: although he had been again and again warned, that he acted so *at his own great peril*, and that a *more severe account* would be required of him *for this very thing*. What follower of the Reformed Churches, reflecting on this, and considering how natural it is for man, from the frailty of his nature to err, but must look with terror to the sentence of his *most severe judge!*—But how different would be the lot of the *Catholic*, even though (could it possibly be believed) he should have fallen into error in obeying the decrees of the church concerning doctrine? Might he not thus fearlessly reply to his Supreme Judge, interrogating him concerning this? 'O Lord, if that be an error which we have followed, THOU, THYSELF, HAST DECEIVED US by thy command, so clearly and repeatedly announced, that we should hear the church AS THYSELF, unless we wished to have our part with the heathen.' (Matt. xviii. and Luke x.) 'THOU, THYSELF, HAST DECEIVED US by thy Apostles, by the pastors and doctors which thou hadst appointed in thy church for the perfecting of the saints, and the edifying of thy body,' (Eph. iv.) 'who commanded us so to act.' 'THOU, THYSELF, HAST DECEIVED US through *thy church*, called by Paul *the pillar and ground of truth*.'—(1 Tim. iii.) 'For that church, by its decrees, always exacted from its children a firm assent in heart and soul, under the denunciations *in thy name* of an *eternal curse* against those who rebelliously refused to obey

its authority. Conscious, alas! of our ignorance in divine things, and of the infirmity of human reason, how could we have trusted to ourselves in searching the Scriptures, and have despised an authority so pre-eminent? *Fearlessly we say, O Lord, if it be an error which we have followed,* THOU, THYSELF, HAST DECEIVED US, AND WE STAND EXCUSED!!'— Removing every prejudice of birth, education, fortune, and all other human circumstances, let the reader, supposing himself to be summoned to-morrow before *the tribunal of God*, to render an account of his faith and motives, conclude what part prudence should suggest to him to act, whether that of the *Protestant*, or of the *Catholic*."

On this I shall offer no comment, but be it remembered, that this is the *authorized decision of the Romish Church in Ireland, at this day*, on the comparative responsibility, and respective doctrines, of the Protestant and the Roman Catholic at the last awful judgment. Thus, then, we see, that the two churches differ, as they have always differed, in the important point of the formation of their respective systems of faith, and of their respective rules of duty. They not only differ from each other, but are directly opposed, both as to the *foundation* on which they build, and as to the *principle* by which they erect the structure: as to the *standard* of their practice, and the *ground* of their responsibility.

But, as to the special *doctrines* which they hold, it has been said, *insidiously* by some, and *inconsiderately* by others, that the two churches agree in essentials: that *our* creeds being held by the church of Rome, the difference lies only in some additional matter not equally important; that a common vital principle is to be found in both; and that the true distinction consists in that church believing what we call *too much*.

This is a strange view of the case, and one certainly not unnatural in those, who have an interest in such representation, and who employ it for the purpose of deception. But, with those who have no such design, it can only be the result of great simplicity of mind, or strange perversity of judg-

ment; or possibly of intimidation, which, in these days of violence and menace, has no mean influence upon opinion in this distracted land. For, surely, it requires no great stretch of thought to discover, that the additional matters of belief may be such, as to do away the great fundamental points contained in the formularies common to both, so as to become not an *addition* but a *subversion:* insomuch that, in truth, it might happen, that they who believe (as it is called) *too much*, and they who believe *too little*, might come to meet in the substantial acknowledgment of the same defective creed, and in the same wide departure from the true creed of the Gospel, which is eminently the fact in the case before us.

This, however, is a topic on which I am unwilling to dwell, and fortunately it is not necessary. You, my reverend brethren, who are acquainted with the additional articles of the creed of Pius, are well aware how little they leave standing of the ancient fabric of the Catholic faith. You also equally well know, that, between the leading doctrines of the churches of England and Rome, there is but little resemblance; and in most of them direct opposition in their true spirit and application, even where they may appear to approach in words. In truth, if this were not so, if the difference between the two religions were not radical and vital, our reformers, instead of entitling themselves to the praise and admiration of all who revere true religion, would have incurred an awful responsibility by their total separation from the Romish communion. And the clergy of the present day would be unjustified in following the example of their great precursors, by continuing their manly protest, and vigorous opposition, against the numerous and deadly errors of that communion.

What has been done, and is doing, by many of your body, to guard your flocks against the contamination of those errors, fully proves that you have not read the gospel under such tuition; that you have not forgotten the condition on which your order was first adopted by the state, any more than the

engagements of your ordination vows, and the duty which you owe to the great invisible Head of the Christian church. Yes, with perfect truth and satisfaction I can affirm, that, with very few exceptions indeed, and those of little note, the Church of England and Ireland does now, as it did in early days, present itself as strictly *Protestant*.

I cannot, although much more remains to be said, encroach longer upon your time, on which I have already so unreasonably trespassed. I shall therefore only add, that I trust it will appear to every candid mind, that our church, possessing the characters and qualifications which I have described, is, on her own account, as well as for the benefits which by these she extends to the community, entitled to the position in which she has been placed by the state.

Established as she is on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone: providing, as far as human prudence can, for a succession of faithful men to inculcate the great mystery of godliness and the true value of the Christian virtues upon the people: duly administering the sacraments of Christ's institution: propounding scriptural articles of faith, and supplying devotional formularies of public worship: exhibiting a catholic spirit towards all other Christian churches, and a charitable feeling for her own members: setting the example of toleration, of adaptation to the wants and circumstances of society, of eminent loyalty and of sound Protestantism, what can the state require for the purpose of utility, what can religion demand for the propagation of its influence, if the members of a church, so circumstanced, will but do their duty *faithfully*, in the important station in which it has pleased Providence to place them?

And may Almighty God, who has appointed the divers orders of his church, so replenish those who fill the same, with the truth of his doctrine, and so endue them with innocency of life, that they may serve before him in their sacred ministry, to the glory of His great name, and to the salvation

of the souls entrusted to their charge, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

In adverting, at pp. 486 and 487, to the existence of the Test Laws in England, it may seem not inappropriate to notice the observation of Warburton, that "it appears at first view evident, that when a church and state are in union, he that cannot give security for his behaviour to *both*, may with as much reason be deprived of some civil advantages as he who, before the union, could not give security to the *state alone*.

The repeal of the Test Acts, which has taken place since this Charge was written, is not claimed as a fact in aid of the arguments repelling the accusation of intolerance, made against the Church of England. Those arguments would be equally vindicatory of the Church of England, had those laws remained unrepealed. The church, as such, had no concern either with the enactment or the repeal. Besides, the reasons on which the repeal was principally founded, had but small connexion with the general principle of the test. That it was already virtually repealed; and that it operated but as a bounty upon hypocrisy and profanation,—were the chief arguments in favour of the repeal. But these arguments went only to the inutility of the repeal, and to the extent of the public profligacy: without affecting, in any degree, the general merits of the question of a test.

INDEXES.

I. OF TEXTS EXPLAINED OR REFERRED TO.

II. OF THE PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

III. OF BOOKS REFERRED TO IN THE DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS ON THE ATONEMENT.

I.

INDEX OF TEXTS

EXPLAINED OR REFERRED TO.

*** *The Texts marked with an asterisk are the Subjects of Sermons.*

OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 3	ii.	24
— 28	i.	355 *note.*
— 29, 30	i.	333. 335, 338, 339. 355 *note.*
ii. 9	i.	355 *note.*
— 16–19	i.	355 *note.*
— 19	i.	342. 349
— 20	i.	342
— 22, 23	i.	355 *note.*
— 23	ii.	127 *note.*
iii. 8	i.	342. 397. 421. 423
— 9	i.	355 *note.* 456
— 10	i.	355 *note.* 423
— 11	i.	355 *note.*
— 12	i.	355 *note.* 397. 421. 423
— 14-22	i.	355 *note.*
iv. 3	i.	441
— 4	i.	317 *note.* 369. 444, 445
— 6	i.	460
— 7	i.	36. 441. 460. 465, 466
— 20	i.	332

GENESIS.

	Vol.	Page.
vi. 4. 7. 11	i.	397
— 14	i.	210
vii. 2	i.	341
— 11	i.	407
— 21	i.	335
viii. 20	i.	341. 468
— 21	i.	368
ix. 3	i.	333, 334
— 4	i.	336, 337
xiv. 5	i.	413 *note.*
— 22	i.	382
xv. 2. 8. 7	i.	382
— 9, 10	i.	329
— 17, 18	i.	329. 369
xvii. 5	ii.	127 *note.*
— 27	ii.	127 *note.*
xviii. 20	i.	459
— 32	i.	93
xx. 7	i.	93
— 9	i.	459
xxii. 2	i.	250, 251
xxiv. 3	i.	382
xxv. 31-34	i.	437
xxvi. 24	i.	93
xxviii. 13. 16	i.	382
xxix. 1	i.	284 *note.*
xxx. 44	ii.	204 *note.*
xxxii. 9	i.	382
— 20	i.	448
— 28	ii.	127 *note.*
xxxiii. 19	i.	378

GENESIS.

	Vol.	Page.
xxxvii. 35	i.	412 *note.*
xlii. 35	i.	379
xliii. 11. 15	i.	448
—— 33	i.	437
xlv. 18	i.	406

EXODUS.

i. 11	i.	275 *note.*
iii. 6	i.	319 *note.*
iv. 24	i.	458
v. 2	i.	222
vi. 3	i.	382
— 9	i.	260
x. 17	i.	290
— 25	i.	468, 469
xii. 5	i.	241
—— 8. 21	i.	194. *and note.*
—— 11, 12	i.	200
—— 13	i.	196 *note.* 201, 202. 204, 205
—— 19	i.	397
—— 21	i.	194
—— 23	i.	201. 204.
—— 27	i.	192. 194 *note.* 206
—— 29	i.	415
xv. 25, 26	i.	366
xvi. 8	i.	365
—— 13	i.	405 *note.*
xviii. 11	i.	222
—— 12	i.	468, 469
xx. 7	i.	231
xxi. 2–6	i.	381
—— 14	i.	222
xxii. 26	i.	456
xxiii. 7	i.	262
—— 18	i.	192. 194
xxiv. 8	i.	329
—— 10	ii.	240 *note.*
xxviii. 38	i.	216, 217. 281. 283
xxix. 14	i.	159. 458, 459
xxx. 9	i.	448
—— 10	i.	458
—— 12. 14. 16	i.	142
xxxii. 21	i.	459

EXODUS.

	Vol.	Page.
xxxii. 30	i.	213. 459
—— 32	i.	213
xxxiv. 6, 7	i.	282
—— 7	i.	285. 289
—— 9	i.	285
—— 25	i.	193, 194, 195
—— 30	i.	456

LEVITICUS.

i. 3	i.	243
— 4	i.	23. 195. 242 *note.*
— 4–9	i.	195 *note.*
— 5	i.	195
ii. 13	i.	329, 330
iii. 2	i.	195
iv. 2	i.	219
— 3	i.	458
— 3–12	i.	233
— 6	i.	377 *note.*
— 13, 14	i.	219
— 13–22	i.	233
— 20	i.	214 *note.*
— 21	i.	458, 459
— 23	i.	219
— 24	i.	195. 458
— 26	i.	195. 214 *note.*
— 28	i.	219
— 29	i.	458
— 31. 35	i.	214 *note.*
v. 2, 3	i.	219
— 4	i.	231
— 5	i.	238
— 8	i.	159
— 9	i.	159. 459
— 10	i.	214 *note.*
— 11	i.	159
— 13. 16	i.	214 *note.*
— 17	i.	219
— 18	i.	214 *note.* 219
vi. 1, 2	i.	223
— 2–7	i.	23
— 3	i.	231
— 7. 18	i.	214 *note.*
— 25	i.	458

LEVITICUS.

	Vol.	Page.
vii. 2	i.	159
—— 8	i.	315. 455
ix. 22	i.	284 *note.*
— 24	i.	369 *note.*
x. 16	i.	287
— 17	i.	281. 283, 284. 287
— 23. 26	i.	287
xi. 44—46	i.	336
xii. 7	i.	173. 218 *note.*
xiv. 32. 34. 49	i.	218 *note.*
xvi. 5	i.	239. ii. 2
—— 6	i.	240
—— 7. 9	ii.	2
—— 10	i.	239. ii. 2
—— 11	i.	240
—— 15–28	i.	233
—— 16. 20	i.	211. 217
—— 17	ii.	2
—— 21	i.	236. 238. 284
—— 22	i.	238. 281. 284 *note.* 288
—— 26	i.	238
xvii. 11	i.	231. 286
xix. 20–22	i.	23.
—— 22	i.	214 *note.*
xx. 19	i.	301
xxii. 21	i.	240
xxiv. 14, 15	i.	242
—— 16	i.	231
xxvi. 18, 23, 28	i.	258
—— 39	i.	221 *note.*

NUMBERS.

v. 7	i.	238
ix. 6, 7	i.	193
— 13	i.	193. 195
xi. 31, 32	i.	405 *note.*
— 33	i.	397. 403. 405
— 34	i.	397. 403
xiv. 18	i.	282. 285. 289
—— 19	i.	282
—— 33	i.	291. 294. 300. 302

NUMBERS.

	Vol.	Page.
xv. 22	i.	220
—— 24	i.	219
—— 24–28	i.	220
—— 25, 26. 28	i.	214 *note.*
—— 27	i.	220. 222
—— 30	i.	222
—— 31	i.	222
xvi. 46, 47, 48	i.	214
xviii. 1	i.	216. 283
—— 8	i.	286
—— 12	i.	440
xix. 2	i.	240
—— 7	i.	216
—— 16	i.	218 *note.*
—— 17	i.	217 *note.*
xxii. 22	i.	383
xxiv. 2	i.	284 *note.*
xxxiii. 1	i.	377 *note.*

DEUTERONOMY.

i. 42, 43	i.	222
iii. 11	i.	413 *note.*
vii. 7	i.	260
xi. 2	i.	258
xii. 5, 6, 11. 14	i.	193
xiv. 3	i.	341
xvi. 2	i.	192, 193
—— 4, 5, 6	i.	192. 195
xvii. 12, 13	i.	222
xviii. 10	i.	246 *note.*
—— 22	i.	222
xxi. 18	i.	258
xxii. 18	i.	258
xxiv. 1	i.	310
xxv. 1	i.	262
xxvii. 26	i.	224. 231
xxviii. 21	i.	280

JOSHUA.

ii. 19	i.	242
*xxiv. 15	ii.	313–349
—— 32	i.	378

JUDGES.

vi. 6	ii.	196 *note.*
— 18	i.	447
— 21	i.	369 *note.*
xiv. 15	ii.	196 *note.*

1 SAMUEL.

	Vol.	Page.
ii. 7	ii.	206 *note.*
— 17	i.	447
xv. 22	i.	365
xxiii. 26	i.	201
xxix. 4	i.	133 *note.*

2 SAMUEL.

i. 16	i.	242
xviii. 33	i.	162
xix. 22	i.	383
xxiv. 16	i.	397. 426 *note.*

1 KINGS.

v. 4	i.	383
viii. 29	i.	162
— 32	i.	262
x. 25	i.	448
xi. 14. 23. 25	i.	383
xii. 11. 14	i.	258
xviii. 29. 36	i.	447
—— 38	i.	369 *note.*
xxii. 19–23	i.	372

2 KINGS.

iii. 20	i.	447
vii. 9	i.	292 *notes.*
viii. 8, 9	i.	448
xii. 16	i.	458
xxiv. 12	i.	397
xxv. 27	i.	397

1 CHRONICLES.

xxi. 15	i.	397. 426 *note.*
—— 26	i.	369 *note.*

2 CHRONICLES.

ii. 2. 18	i.	271
vi. 23	i.	262
vii. 1	i.	369 *notes.* 440
—— 16	i.	193
ix. 24	i.	448
x. 11. 14	i.	258

2 CHRONICLES.

	Vol.	Page.
xxix. 23	i.	240
xxx. 15, 16	i.	194
xxxii. 23	i.	448
xxxiv. 13	i.	271
xxxv. 5, 6. 10, 11	i.	193, 194

EZRA.

vi. 19. 22	i.	197
ix. 4, 5	i.	447

NEHEMIAH.

iv. 45	i.	210

ESTHER.

vii. 8	i.	406 *note.*
viii. 1. 7	i.	406 *note.*
ix. 25	i.	216

JOB.

i. 4	i.	139
i. 5	i.	37. 468
ii. 9	i.	402 *note.*
iii. 19	i.	381
iv. 10	i.	423 *note.*
v. 16	i.	386
vii. 9	i.	409 *note.*
viii. 10	i.	386
x. 11	i.	456
— 16	i.	423 *note.*
xi. 8	i.	409 *note.*
xii. 12	i.	374
—— 17	i.	397
xiv. 13	i.	469 *note.*
xv. 10	i.	373
—— 30	i.	384
xvi. 2. 6	i.	209 *note.*
xvii. 13. 16	i.	409 *note.*
—— 23	i.	411 *note.*
xviii. 13	i.	438
xix. 4	i.	402 *note.*
—— 20. 26	i.	456
—— 23–29	i.	395 *note.*
xx. 9	i.	409 *note.*
—— 20	i.	397. 403
—— 22	i.	411 *note.*
xxi. 13	i.	409 *note.*
xxiv. 19	i.	409 *note.*
xxvi. 5	i.	397. 406

JOB.

	Vol.	Page.
xxviii. 8	i.	423 *note.*
xxx. 1	i.	373
—— 29	i.	424 *note.*
xxxi. 28	i.	381
—— 33	i.	397. 421
xxxii. 6, 7	i.	373, 374
xxxiii. 19	i.	269 *note.*
—— 23	i.	397. 426
xxxiv. 17–20	i.	418–420 *notes.*
—— 20	i.	397. 413. 421
—— 23, 24	i.	420 *note.*
—— 26	i.	410 *note.*
—— 37	i.	411 *note.*
xxxvi. 8–12	i.	397
—— 18	i.	411 *note.*
—— 28	i.	402 *note.*
xxxvii. 13	i.	258
xxxviii. 1	i.	394
xxxix. 34	i.	402 *note.*
xl. 14	i.	381
xli. 11, 12	i.	433 *note.*
xlii. 5	i.	394
—— 6, 7	i.	434 *note.*
—— 7, 8	i.	19. 138. 420
—— 11	i.	379. 433 *note.*
—— 12	i.	433 *note.*

PSALMS.

	Vol.	Page.
vi. 1	i.	258
vii. 16	i.	242
xiv. 13	i.	269 *note.*
xvi. 10	i.	412 *note.*
xx. 3	i.	369
xxv. 7	i.	221 *note.*
xxx. 4	i.	412 *note.*
xxxii. 1	i.	210
—— 6	i.	285 *note.*
—— 10	i.	268
xxxiii. 3	i.	461 *note.*
xxxiv. 10	ii.	196 *note.*
xxxviii. 1	i.	258
—— 17	i.	268
xxxix. 11	i.	258
xl. 6	i.	364
— 7	i.	159

PSALMS.

	Vol.	Page.
xlix. 16	ii.	204 *note.*
l. 5. 16	i.	329
— 8, 9. 13	i.	364
li. 16	i.	364
lxix. 29	i.	268
lxxi. 13	i.	383
lxxii. 10	i.	448
lxxviii. 30	i.	404
lxxix. 8	ii.	196 *note.*
lxxx. 7	i.	275 *note.*
lxxxi. 16	i.	440
lxxxii. 3	i.	262
lxxxv. 2	i.	210
lxxxvi. 15	i.	282
xci. 13	i.	423 *note.*
xciv. 17	i.	412 *note.*
ciii. 3	i.	273
civ. 4	i.	319 *note.*
cv. 40	i.	405 *note.*
cix. 20. 29	i.	383
cxviii. 18	i.	258
cxlvii. 14	i.	440

PROVERBS.

	Vol.	Page.
iii. 11	i.	258
ix. 18	i.	414 *note.*
xiii. 7	ii.	191 *note.*
—— 24	i.	258
xiv. 13	i.	268
xv. 8	i.	364
xvii. 15	i.	262
xix. 18	i.	258
xx. 4	i.	260
xxi. 17	ii.	204 *note.*
— 16	i.	414 *note.*
*—— 30, 31	ii.	353–371
xxii. 15	i.	258
xxiii. 4	ii.	204 *note.*
—— 21	ii.	196 *note.*
xxvi. 13	i.	423 *note.*
xxvii. 20	i.	414 *note.*
xxviii. 22	ii.	204 *note.*
xxx. 16	i.	414 *note.*
—— 29	i.	461 *note.*

ECCLESIASTES.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 18	i.	268

ECCLESIASTES.

	Vol.	Page.
ii. 18	i.	268

ISAIAH.

i. 8	i.	262
i. 11, 12	i.	364
v. 14	i.	405 *note.* 414 *note.*
— 23	i.	262
vii. 14	ii.	95
ix. 6	i.	51
xiv. 9	i.	408, 409 *note.* 411
—- 11. 15	i.	409 *note.*
xxiii. 16	i.	461 *note.*
xxvi. 14	i.	413 *note.*
—— 16	i.	258
xxviii. 4	i.	438 *note.*
——- 7	i.	220
——— 15. 18	i.	409 *note.*
xxxi. 5	i.	202, 203. 205, 206
xxxiii. 24	i.	280
xxxv. 5	i.	278
*xxxviii. 1	ii.	377—394
——— 10. 18	i.	409 *note.*
xl. 2	i.	292 *note.*
xlvi. 4	i.	270
xlix. 23	i.	383 *note.*
l. 8	i.	262
liii. 3	i.	269
— 4	i.	234. 266, 267. 273. 278. 283. 296, 299, 300, 301, 302
— 5	i.	256. 258
— 6	i.	294 *note.*
— 5-8	i.	144
— 9, 10	i.	257
— 7	i.	141. 259
— 8	i.	260
— 10	i.	20. 146. 156. 256. 261
— 11	i.	257. 261–263. 266. 270. 280. 291. 300, 301, 302

ISAIAH.

	Vol.	Page.
liii. 12	i.	250, 251. 263. 266. 280. 291. 301, 302
lvii. 9	i.	409 *note.*
lx. 16	i.	383 *note.*
lxv. 14	i.	268
lxvi. 3	i.	364

JEREMIAH.

ii. 19. 30	i.	258
v. 3	i.	258
— 27	ii.	204 *note.*
vii. 22	i.	364, 365
— 23	i.	365
x. 24	i.	258
xxiii. 6	i.	229, 230 *notes.*
xxiv. 2	i.	438 *note.*
xxx. 11. 14	i.	258
—— 15	i.	268
xxxi. 18	i.	258
—— 29, 30	i.	292
xlvi. 28	i.	258
li. 6	i.	292 *note.*
— 9	i.	284 *note.*

LAMENTATIONS.

iv. 21	i.	376
v. 7	i.	263. 270. 292. 301

EZEKIEL.

i. 19, 20, 21	i.	284 *note.*
— 26	ii.	125
iii. 14	i.	284 *note.*
iv. 4, 5	i.	281
v. 15	i.	258
x. 16	i.	284 *note.*
xiv. 14	i.	394
xviii. 2	i.	292, 293, 294
—— 13	i.	294
—— 19, 20	i.	292. 301
—— 19. 23	i.	231
xx. 15. 23	i.	284 *note.*
xxiii. 48	i.	258

EZEKIEL.

	Vol.	Page.
xxxii. 30	i.	301
xxxiii. 32	i.	461 *note.*
xliv. 29	i.	143
xlv. 23	i.	458

DANIEL.

ii. 35	i.	284 *note.*
iii. 33	ii.	136 *note.*
iv. 31	ii.	136 *note.*
vii. 13, 14	ii.	125 *note.*
xii. 3	i.	262

HOSEA.

iv. 8	i.	159. 458
— 15	i.	221 *note.*
v. 14	i.	423 *note.*
vi. 6	i.	365
vii. 12	i.	258
ix. 10	i.	438 *note.*
x. 13	i.	292 *note.*
xii. 8	ii.	204 *note.*
xiii. 7	i.	423 *note.*

JOEL.

ii. 13	i.	365

AMOS.

	Vol.	Page.
v. 21, 22	i.	364

MICAH.

v. 2	ii.	98, 99

NAHUM.

iii. 11	i.	260

HABAKKUK.

ii. 5	i.	414 *note.*

ZECHARIAH.

ii. 13	i.	373
iii. 1	i.	373
v. 7	i.	284 *note.*
xi. 5	ii.	204 *note.*
xii. 3	i.	275 *note.*
xiv. 19	i.	292 *note.*

MALACHI.

i. 13	i.	447
— 14	i.	241. 447
ii. 7	i.	464 *note.*
iii. 1	i.	464 *note.*

APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

TOBIT.

iv. 21	ii.	196 *note.*

JUDITH.

v. 19, 20	i.	221 *note.*
xv. 7	ii.	204 *note.*

WISDOM.

iii. 5	i.	258

WISDOM.

xvii. 8	i.	273

ECCLESIASTICUS.

xi. 17	ii.	204 *note.*
xvii. 5	i.	355 *note.*

1 MACCABEES.

xiii. 39	i.	221 *note.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 16, 17	ii.	262 *note.*
— 19	i.	309, 310
— 21	i.	394
	ii.	95, 96
— 23	ii.	96
ii. 2. 11, 12 6. 18	ii.	97, 98
iii. 6	ii.	285 *note.*
— 15	ii.	103
iv. 36	ii.	119 *note.*
v. 3. 7. 10. 44	ii.	103
— 23	i.	18
— 24	i.	18. 132–134
— 28	ii.	102
— 42	ii.	101, 102
vi. 12–15	ii.	103
— 25	i.	450
vii. 1, 2	ii.	101. 103
— 3	ii.	139 *note.*
— 12	ii.	101
— 29	ii.	137 *note.*
viii. 17	i.	264, 265. 273, 274. 276. 278 *note.* 298
— 22	ii.	156 *note.*
ix. 2	i.	278 *note.* 280
— 13	ii.	101
— 42	ii.	101
x. 15	ii.	120 *note.*
— 16	ii.	103
— 32, 33	ii.	102
xi. 4	i.	278
— 10	i.	464 *note.*
— 22. 24	ii.	120 *note.*
xii. 33	ii.	103
— 36	ii.	120 *note.*
— 41	i.	450
xiii. 5–7. 20–22. 31, 32	ii.	102
— 15	i.	280
xiv. 33	ii.	120 *note.*
— 19	ii.	139 *note.*
xv. 9	i.	316

MATTHEW.

	Vol.	Page.
xvi. 24	ii.	101
xviii. 3, 4	ii.	102
— 6	ii.	101
— 19, 20	ii.	103
— 35	i.	221 *note.*
xix. 12	ii.	103
— 23, 24	ii.	102
— 29	ii.	139 *note.*
xx. 12	i.	274
— 16	ii.	101
— 28	i.	144. 156. 231. 299. 304
xxii. 43, 44	ii.	101
xxiii. 6	ii.	102
xxiv. 22	ii.	101
xxv. 5, 6. 10	ii.	101
xxvi. 18	i.	182 *note.*
— 24	ii.	101
— 26	i.	198
— 28	i.	39 *note.* 144. 299. 304
— 31	ii.	101
— 41	ii.	103
— 53	ii.	183 *note.*
— 61	ii.	137 *note.*
— 65	ii.	128 *note.*
xxvii. 54	ii.	120 *note.*
xxviii. 18	ii.	102

MARK.

i. 4	ii.	285 *note.*
— 22	i.	122 *note.*
ii. 8	ii.	236 *note.*
— 9	ii.	193 *note.*
iv. 12	i.	280
v. 26	i.	271
— 41	ii.	141 *note.*
vii. 7	i.	367
ix. 49	i.	329
— 50	ii.	102
x. 45	i.	144
— 46	i.	230
xii. 26	i.	320 *note.*
xiv. 13	i.	274
— 22	i.	194 *note.*

MARK.

	Vol.	Page.
xiv. 64	ii.	128 *note.*
xv. 39	ii.	120

LUKE.

i. 5	ii.	285 *note.*
— 31	ii.	96
— 35	ii.	116.
		126 *note.*
		127 *note.*
		131 *note.*
— 53	ii.	197 *note.*
— 77	i.	279
ii. 23	ii.	127 *note.*
iii. 1, 2, 3	ii.	285 *note.*
— 23	ii.	78
— 24	ii.	262, 263 *notes.*
iv. 3. 9	ii.	119 *note.*
vi. 30	ii.	101
— 36, 37, 38	ii.	101
vii. 14	i.	274
— 27	i.	464 *note.*
xii. 5	ii.	136 *note.*
xiii. 24, 25	ii.	102
xiv. 27	i.	274.
	ii.	103
xvi. 18	ii.	102
xvii. 2	ii.	101
xviii. 12	ii.	443
xxii. 70	ii.	118 *note.*

JOHN.

i. 1	ii.	9 *note.*
— 1–14	i.	54.
	ii.	9 *note.*
— 6	ii.	156 *note.*
— 10	i.	53.
	ii.	84
— 12	ii.	116.
		136 *note.*
		140 *note.*
— 14	i.	123 *note.*
	ii.	131 *note.*
— 15	ii.	187 *note.*
— 18	ii.	152.
		186 *note.*
		187 *note.*
— 29	i.	20. 140–142. 198. 204

JOHN.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 50	ii.	117
ii. 19	ii.	138.
		141 *note.*
		142
iii. 8	ii.	103
— 13	ii.	116.
		152 *note.*
		154 *note.*
		160
— 13. 31	i.	48
— 16	i.	15
— 31	ii.	152 *note.*
v. 14	i.	280
— 18	ii.	128 *note.*
— 26	ii.	133 *note.*
— 27	ii.	125 *note.*
— 28, 29	ii.	141 *note.*
— 30	i.	310 *note.*
vi. 27	i.	365
— 38	i.	48.
	ii.	152 *note.*
— 62	i.	48. 59.
	ii.	152 *note.*
		155 *note.*
		156, 157 *notes.*
vii. 24	i.	310 *note.*
viii. 29	ii.	103
— 56	ii.	239 *note.*
— 57, 58	i.	55, 56.
	ii.	187, 188 *notes.*
ix. 17	ii.	182 *note.*
— 25	ii.	182 *note.*
		184 *note.*
x. 9	ii.	103
— 17, 18	ii.	135
		138 *note.*
		139 *note.*
— 33	ii.	123 *note.*
xi. 44	ii.	141 *note.*
— 50, 51, 52	i.	304
xii. 6	i.	274
— 41	ii.	238 *note.*
— 49	ii.	103
— 49, 50	ii.	141 *note.*
xiii. 3	i.	48
	ii.	156 *note.*
		157 *note.*
— 7	ii.	183 *note.*

JOHN.

	Vol.	Page.
xiii. 12	ii.	139 *note.*
— 37	ii.	183 *note.*
xiv. 6	ii.	102
xv. 26	ii.	12
xvi. 7, 8. 13	ii.	12
— 11	ii.	103
— 12	i.	274. 276. 306
— 28	i.	48
	ii.	103. 156 *note.* 157 *note.*
xvii. 5	ii.	178 *note.*
xix. 7	ii.	118 *note.* 128 *note.*
— 36	i.	198
xx. 15	i.	274. 276

ACTS.

i. 7	ii.	136 *note.*
ii. 24	ii.	103. 137 *note.*
— 32	ii.	141 *note.*
iii. 15	ii.	137 *note.*
— 17	i.	219
iv. 12	ii.	97
v. 41	ii.	102
vii. 2	ii.	239 *note.*
— 15, 16	i.	378
— 30. 32	ii.	239 *note.*
— 56	ii.	85, 86. 125 *note.*
— 60	ii.	85
viii. 32	i.	141. 144
— 33	i.	144
— 35	i.	264
ix. 20	ii.	131 *note.*
— 34, 35	i.	89
x. 38	ii.	231 *note.*
— 40	ii.	141 *note.*
— 41	ii.	103
— 42	ii.	101
— 43	ii.	97
xiii. 22	ii.	101
— 32, 33	i.	451
— 33	ii.	131 *note.*
xv. 10	i.	274
xvii. 31	ii.	137 *note.* 141 *note.*
xx. 28	ii.	86

ACTS.

	Vol.	Page.
xx. 35	ii.	101
xxv. 24	ii.	68 *note.*
xxvi. 18	ii.	136 *note.*

ROMANS.

i. 1, 2	ii.	130 *note.*
— 3	ii.	172 *note.*
— 4	ii.	117, 118 *notes.* 138 *note.*
— 7	ii.	168 *note.*
— 29-32	i.	10
	ii.	101
ii. 5	i.	310 *note.*
— 20	ii.	101
iii. 24	i.	144
— 25	i.	144. 307, 308, *and notes.* 309, 310
— 20	i.	140. 308 *note.*
— 26	i.	310 *note.*
iv. 3	ii.	101
— 25	i.	144. 299
	ii.	3
v. 6	i.	299
— 6-10	i.	144
— 8	i.	162 *note.*
— 9	i.	136
— 10	i.	133, 134
— 11	i.	20. 157, 158
— 16	i.	221 *note.*
	ii.	101
vi. 4	i.	50
	ii.	141 *note.*
viii. 3	i.	156
—— 11	ii.	102. 137 *note.* 141 *note.*
—— 27	ii.	67 *note.*
—— 32	i.	20
—— 33	i.	262
—— 34	ii.	67 *note.*
—— 38, 39	ii.	103
ix. 4	ii.	101, 102
— 5	ii.	101. 116. 161. 163 *notes.*

ROMANS.

	Vol.	Page.
ix. 10, 11, 12	ii.	101
— 21	ii.	136 *note.*
x. 3	i.	219 *note.*
— 17	i.	451
xi. 2	ii.	67 *note.*
— 15	i.	134
— 29	ii.	102
— 36	ii.	101
xii. 17	ii.	103
xiii. 9, 10	ii.	103
xiv. 1. 3	ii.	101
— 10. 12	ii.	103
xv. 1	i.	274
	ii.	101
— 7	ii.	103
— 8	ii.	101

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 5	ii.	204 *note.*
— 10	ii.	103
— 12	ii.	101
— 18, 19, 20	ii.	103
— 23, 24	i.	1—27
iii. 16	ii.	101, 102
— 17	ii.	102
— 19	i.	394
iv. 4	ii.	103
— 8	ii.	204 *note.*
v. 7	i.	145. 192. 198
	ii.	103
— 11	ii.	103
vi. 2	ii.	103
— 9, 10	ii.	103
vii. 15	ii.	102
ix. 4, 5, 6	ii.	137 *note.*
x. 9	ii.	223 *note.*
— 24	ii.	101
xi. 20	ii.	101
— 26	i.	38
xii. 12. 15. 22. 24	ii.	101
xiii. 4	ii.	101
— 7	i.	271
— 12	ii.	183 *note.*
xv. 3	i.	145. 299
— 8	ii.	103
— 15	ii.	137 *note.*
— 20	ii.	101 *note.*

1 CORINTHIANS.

	Vol.	Page.
xv. 45	ii.	236 *note.*
— 47	i.	48
	ii.	227 *note.* 234, 235 *notes.* 237 *note*
— 48, 49	ii.	236 *note.*
xvi. 7	ii.	183 *note.*

2 CORINTHIANS.

iii. 18	ii.	101
iv. 14	ii.	103
v. 14, 15	ii.	103
— 17	ii.	101
— 18, 19	i.	134. 157
— 20	i.	134
— 21	i.	145. 146. 299
vi. 7	ii.	103
vii. 10	ii.	102
viii. 5	ii.	101
— 9	ii.	116. 188 *note.* 191 *note.* 200. 202 *note.* 203, 204 *and notes.* 207. 220
— 21	ii.	103
x. 17, 18	ii.	101
xi. 24, 25	ii.	101
— 31	ii.	171 *note.*
xii. 2. 4	i.	372
xiii. 4	ii.	3

GALATIANS.

i. 1	ii.	101. 103
— 4	i.	162 *note.*
	ii.	101
iii. 10	i.	224. 231
— 13	i.	299
— 27	ii.	102
iv. 4	ii.	125 *note.*
— 26	ii.	103
v. 4	ii.	103
— 10	i.	274
vi. 2	i.	274
— 7	ii.	103

EPHESIANS.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 7	i.	145
— 19, 20	ii.	131 *note.*
ii. 2	ii.	101
— 5	ii.	184 *note.*
— 8, 9	ii.	103
— 16	i.	134
— 22	ii.	103
iii. 9	i.	51, 52
	ii.	68 *note.*
iv. 3	ii.	103
— 4, 5	ii.	101, 102, 103
— 6	ii.	101
— 18	i.	219
— 26	ii.	103
— 30, 31	ii.	102
v. 2	i.	299
	ii.	103
— 16, 17	ii.	101
— 25, 29	ii.	103
vi. 13, 14. 16, 17	ii.	103

PHILIPPIANS.

i. 10	ii.	101
— 21	ii.	103
ii. 3	ii.	103
— 5, 6, 7	i.	47
	ii.	101. 103. 168 *note.* 176. 202, 203. 207 *note.* 218
— 8	i.	48
— 10, 11. 16	ii.	103
iv. 5	ii.	101
— 18	ii.	102

COLOSSIANS.

i. 7	ii.	103
— 10	ii.	101
— 14	i.	145
— 15, 16	i.	49
	ii.	68 *note.* 102. 239 *note.*
— 16	i.	50 *note.* 52, 53

COLOSSIANS.

	Vol.	Page.
i. 17	ii.	178 *note.*
— 20, 21	i.	134
— 28	ii.	103
ii. 13	ii.	184 *note.*
— 22, 23	i.	316

1 THESSALONIANS.

ii. 7	ii.	183 *note.*
iv. 16	ii.	141 *note.*
— 16, 17	ii.	159 *note.*
v. 4, 5. 7, 8	ii.	155 *note.*
— 13	ii.	102
— 17	ii.	102, 103
— 18. 23	ii.	101
— 22	ii.	103

2 THESSALONIANS.

i. 5	i.	310 *note.*
iii. 15	ii.	103

1 TIMOTHY.

i. 13	i.	219 *note.*
ii. 1. 12	ii.	103
— 6	i.	145. 156 *note.* 230. 299
— 8	ii.	101
— 14	i.	366
iii. 13	ii.	101
— 16	ii.	101 *note.* 131 *note.*
v. 4	ii.	101
vi. 4	i.	273
— 7. 10	ii.	163
— 9. 18	ii.	204 *note.*

2 TIMOTHY.

i. 9	ii.	101
— 10	ii.	101
— 14	ii.	102
— 16. 18	ii.	103
ii. 4	ii.	103
— 9	i.	271
— 11, 12	ii.	103
iv. 8	i.	310 *note.*
— 10	ii.	103
— 18	ii.	102

TITUS.

	Vol.	Page.
ii. 3	ii.	103
— 13	ii.	168 *note.*
— 14	i.	299
iii. 1	ii.	101

PHILEMON.

20	ii.	103

HEBREWS.

i. 2, 3	i.	48, 49. 145
	ii.	102
— 4, 5. 7	ii.	102
— 13	ii.	102
ii. 6	ii.	125 *note.*
— 7. 9	ii.	243 *note.* 244 *note.*
— 17	i.	145. 158
iii. 2	ii.	102
— 5	ii.	101, 102
iv. 12	ii.	102. 104
— 13	ii.	104
vi. 18	ii.	102
vii. 3	ii.	247 *note.*
— 13, 14. 17	i.	190
— 26	ii.	26 *note.*
— 27	i.	133
	ii.	143 *note.*
ix. 7	i.	220
— 9	i.	226
— 9—14	i.	32. 470
— 12, 13, 14. 22, 23, 24. 26	i.	471
— 12—28	i.	145
*— 22	i.	29—44. 471
— 28	i.	299. 303
x. 1.	i.	21. 31. 226
— 10, 14, 18	i.	145
— 12	i.	31
— 25	ii.	101
— 26	i.	135. 222
— 27	i.	135
— 28	ii.	103
— 29	i.	471
	ii.	103

HEBREWS.

	Vol.	Page.
xi. 3	i.	50
— 4	i.	33. 368. 441. 448
— 5. 7, 8	ii.	102
— 21	i.	464 *note.*
— 31, 32—37. 39	ii.	102
xii. 1, 2, 6. 9, 10, 11	ii.	102
— 2	ii.	203
— 17	ii.	102
— 24	i.	36. 38. 197
	ii.	244 *note.*
— 25, 26	ii.	116. 233
xiii. 9	ii.	103
— 20, 21	i.	44

JAMES.

i. 5	ii.	102
— 6, 7, 8	ii.	102
ii. 7	ii.	102
— 10	i.	231
— 21, 23	ii.	102
iii. 13	ii.	102
— 15. 17	ii.	102
iv. 2	ii.	102
— 3, 4	ii.	102
— 6	ii.	102
— 7. 12	ii.	102
v. 1, 2. 4	ii.	102
— 15	i.	280

1 PETER.

i. 6, 7	ii.	102
— 8. 13	ii.	104
— 10	ii.	242 *note.*
— 12	ii.	243 *note.*
— 14	i.	219
— 17	ii.	101
— 18, 19	i.	16. 142. 145
— 20	i.	16
— 21	ii.	104
ii. 5	ii.	101

1 PETER.

	Vol.	Page.
ii. 11, 12. 17. 22	ii.	104
— 24	i.	264. 277 *note.* 279. 294 *note.* 296. 299. 303
	ii.	104
iii. 9. 14	ii.	104
— 17	i.	271
— 18	i.	299
— 19	ii.	159 *note.*
iv. 5. 7	ii.	104
— 8	ii.	102
v. 5	ii.	102, 103, 104
— 7	ii.	102

2 PETER.

i. 3	i.	49 *note.*
— 21	i.	113, 114
ii. 4, 5. 7, 8	i.	361
— 5, 6, 7. 9	ii.	102
— 9	ii.	120 *note.*
— 15. 20	ii.	102
iii. 4	ii.	102
— 7	ii.	120 *note.*
— 10	ii.	101

1 JOHN.

i. 2	ii.	103
ii. 2	i.	20. 143, 144. 157, 158
— 7	ii.	104
— 27	ii.	102
iv. 2	ii.	132 *note.*

1 JOHN.

	Vol.	Page.
iv. 3	ii.	104
— 6	ii.	102
— 10	i.	15. 20. 143. 145. 158
— 17	ii.	121 *note.*
v. 6	ii.	102
— 7	ii.	161 *note.*

2 JOHN.

4	ii.	102

3 JOHN.

2	ii.	103
3, 4	ii.	102

JUDE.

3	ii.	104
6. 14, 15	i.	361
21. 24	ii.	102

REVELATION.

i. 13	ii.	125 *note.*
iii. 17, 18	ii.	204 *note.*
iv. 1, 2	i.	372
v. 9	i.	142
— 9—12	i.	145
xiii. 8	i.	16. 34. 145
xiv. 14	ii.	125 *note.*
xviii. 3. 15. 19	ii.	204 *note.*
xix. 2	i.	310 *note.*
xx. 6	ii.	136 *note.*
xxii. 8	ii.	184 *note.*
—— 12	ii.	101

II.

INDEX

OF

THE PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

Abarbanel,—his testimony respecting expiatory sacrifices among the Jews, i. 168–172. 174.

Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac,—a singular resemblance to it in the *Mystical sacrifice of the Phœnicians*, i. 248–252.

Αγνοημάτα, or *sins of ignorance*,—fully explained, i. 218–222.—Opinion of the Rabbins concerning sins of this description, i. 172, 173.

Animal food,—not granted to man before the Flood, i. 333–342.

Apostolical Fathers, — their references to various passages of the New Testament, ii. 89, 90, 91. 94. 100–105—the nature and objects of their writings, ii. 92, 93. 100–105—their silence respecting the first two chapters of St. Matthew falsely urged as an argument against the authenticity of those chapters, ii. 91–106.

Articles (*Thirty-nine*),—observations on the interpretation of, ii. 418–421—they are neither Calvinistic nor Arminian, but Christian, 420. 428—the royal declaration prefixed to them, 426—remarks on it, 427—reduced in number to *twenty-five* by *Mr. Wesley*; and those which are retained by him, materially altered, i. 106 *note*—not to be subscribed unless by those who believe the doctrines which they propound, ii. 15, 16. 18, 19—the bearing of the *Sixth Article* on the interpretation of the rest, ii. 15—Mr. Fellowes's unjustifiable notions of their meaning and obligation, ii. 14–22—Dr. Paley, Mr. Gisborne, Dr. Powel, and Bishop Tomline, referred to upon their interpretation, ii. 18, 19 *notes*.

Asiatic Researches,—quoted respecting human sacrifices, i. 67, 68—the *London* Edition of this work contains a *wicked fabrication* calculated to subvert *revelation*, i. 489 *note*.

Association for discountenancing vice,—important objects of, ii. 314. 339—brief review of its efforts, 339–348.

Atheists,—a society of, cannot exist, ii. 325—fatal influence of Atheism in France, 326. 330–333.

Atonement,—publication of the discourses and dissertations on, i. xxviii—dedication of them to the Rt. Hon. W. C. Plunket, i. ii—prefatory address of them to the Divinity Students of Trinity College, lxxxv–xc.—high opinion entertained of the work by Mr. Perceval, xxx—and by H.R.H. the Princess Charlotte, xxxi—the meaning of the word translated *Atonement* in the Old Testament, i. 207–215—the re-

ceived doctrine of, objected to on the ground that Christ's death was not a *propitiatory sacrifice*, i. 19, 20 — Objection answered by texts of Scripture describing it as such, i. 20. 144, 145—Objected, that the language in these texts is figurative, i. 20. 145. 160. 164 — Objection answered, i. 21, 22. 140–142 — Leading arguments against the doctrine, urged with their greatest force by Ben Mordecai, i. 165—Levitical *atonement* said by B. Mordecai and Dr. Priestley to imply only ceremonial purification, i. 209. 214—the contrary shewn, i. 209–215—more minutely argued, i. 215–227—Atonements in the Old Testament extended to the violations of *moral* law, and procured a real forgiveness, i. 22, 23. 222–227 — Objections against the doctrine, *unfairly* drawn from the expression, vicarious punishment, i. 227, 228 — Arguments brought by Sykes and B. Mordecai against the doctrine, on the supposition of an implied *vicarious substitution*, i. 228, 229—shewn to have no weight against the *true* notion of atonement, i. 229–236—*Christian* atonement described by the terms, *bearing sins*, &c., in such manner, as to convey the *propitiatory* and *vicarious* import more strongly than is expressed in the *Mosaic*, i. 230, 231. 254, 255 — inconsistency in the arguments urged on this head against the doctrine, i. 254—language of the New Testament more circumstantial and precise upon the nature of atonement, than that of the Old, i. 41. 475, 476—contended by Dr. Priestley, that no trace whatever of the doctrine is to be found either in Old or New Testament, i. 303—refuted, i. 303–306—the doctrine, why not as fully explained in the Gospels as in the Epistles, i. 304–306—Doctrine of atonement does not sink our ideas of the divine *mercy*, i. 312–314—opposition to the doctrine arising generally from what cause, i. 26 — see *Redemption*.

Bailly,—maintains an extravagant antiquity of the *Indian Astronomy*, i. 490—followed by *Professor Playfair*, *ibid.*—confuted by *La Place*, i. 491, 492—and by *Mr. Bentley*, 492, 493.

Balguy's excellent argument to prove the *natural* insufficiency of repentance to procure forgiveness of sins, i. 62, 63. 140.

Baptism, observations on, ii. 403, 404.

Barbauld (Mrs.)—her admirable remarks on prayer, i. 92—defender of public worship against Wakefield, i. 117—represents good works as giving a *claim of right* to divine acceptance, *ibid.*—a highly accomplished writer, ii. 40 *note*.

Beattie (Dr.)—his excellent confutation and exposure of *Hume*, i. 508–511. 514—pronounces the human invention of language to be impossible, i. 345.

Bellamy's (Mr.) version of the Old Testament, character of, ii. 425.

Belsham, (Mr.)—rejects the notion of Christ's pre-existence, i. 47, 48—refers to others for the proof, i. 48—indulges in impious raillery on the subject of atonement, i. 112—has no fixed creed, i. 116—explains the difference between *Unitarians* and *Socinians*, i. 101—argues in support of a *purgatory*, ii. 30. 35—denies that any religious address should be offered to Christ, ii. 32—maintains, in opposition to the received notion of the corruption of human nature, the preponderance of virtue over vice, ii. 31. 33 — makes virtue, *mechanism*, ii. 33, 34—overturns his own scheme of *merit*, ii. 33–35—must on his own principles reject the notion of punishment altogether, ii. 35, 36—adopts the principle of *predestination*, ii. 35–37—and the *fatalism* of the Stoic, ii. 36—inconsistently recommends gratitude to God, ii. 37—his new mode

of reforming a sinner, ii. 38-40—objects specially to *remorse* in the sinner, as a thing pernicious, ii. 38 *note*—inconsistently calls upon the sinner to reform, whilst the principles which he advances go to prove the impossibility of reformation, ii. 38 — adopts the unintelligible phraseology of the Illuminati, ii. 39—rejects the idea of *prayer*, and necessarily, ii. 39, 40—objects to the Sabbatical observance, as forbidden by the Gospel, i. 60. ii. 40, 41—considers it injurious to the cause of virtue, ii. 41—short view of Mr. B.'s Christianity, ii. 41-43 —differs little from the deism of Lepaux, i. 114. ii. 43, 44—Mr. B. *a moral teacher*, ii. 44—but not a teacher of Christianity, *ibid.*—admits himself to be nearer to Infidelity than to Orthodoxy, ii. 44, 45—guilty of a total want of charity in his judgment of the Clergy of the Established Church, ii. 45-48 —arrogates to himself exclusively the profession of a *pure* Christianity, ii. 48—complains of persecution, *ibid.*—his proof of this persecution, *ibid.* — sufficiency of this proof considered, ii. 49-51—asserts the Unitarian cause to be progressive, ii. 52—in what sense this can be allowed to be true, *ibid.* — his assertion of the increase of the number of Unitarians borrows an appearance of truth from one circumstance, ii. 55, 56—One most extraordinary and irrefragable proof of Mr. B.'s assertion, ii. 56—he admits Unitarianism to be hard to be understood, ii. 58 *note*—called on to account for the dissolution of the Academy of Hackney, i. 61. ii. 52. 58—admits and glories in the licentiousness of the system at Hackney, ii. 53 *note*—explains how the Unitarians contrive to retain the Bible, ii. 59—interprets like Lord Peter, ii. 60—enjoys an exclusive monopoly of the powers of reasoning, ii. 60-63—exhibits singular proofs of this in a treatise on Logics, Metaphysics, and Morals, by a reference to which treatise his high claims are estimated, ii. 60 62 *notes* — classes the clergy of the establishment under the heads of impostors and bigots, ii. 63 — charges Doddridge with supporting from prejudice an erroneous and unscriptural system, ii. 63 *note*—refers for the proof of the truth of his tenets to other Commentators, ii. 64—has made a good selection for his purpose, *ibid.*—why he could not add Paine, ii. 65—why not Geddes, ii. 65 *note*—exhibits a few specimens of his own criticism, ii. 65, 66 — pretends to convict St. Paul of ignorance, ii. 66—sets him right, *ibid.*—commends Dr. Taylor's *Scripture Key*, reason why, i. 122. ii. 31—refers to Dr. Taylor, whose observations make against him, ii. 66, 67 *notes*—compares Bonaparte to Jesus Christ, ii. 68 *note*—has given a *new* digest of the Unitarian creed as touching the person of Christ, ii. 69 *note*—asserts that the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles is to be received with great caution and distrust, ii. 69 *note* — expresses doubts as to the *moral character* of our Saviour, ii. 70 *note*—said to be the author of an anonymous pamphlet of a contemptible description, ii. 110-112 —his strange remarks on John v. 27 exposed, ii. 123, 124 *notes*—his extraordinary reasoning on Luke i. 35 exposed, ii. 126-129 *notes*—his gross falsification of Schleusner exposed, ii. 139 *note*—his extraordinary attempts at criticism and reasoning on John ii. 19 and x. 17 exposed, ii. 138-142 *notes*—his monstrous absurdities on the subject of *expiation for moral offences*, ii. 143, 144 *notes* — ascribes *enigmatical* meanings to our Lord's discourses, ii. 153, 154 *notes*—explains Christ's *descent from and ascent into heaven*, as meaning nothing either of coming from or going to heaven, ii. 154 -160 *notes*—proves from astronomy

that there is *no heaven*, ii. 158 *note*, *col.* 2—at the same time contends for Christ's *going into heaven*, ii. 159 *note*—exhibits a curious instance of his want of acquaintance with Greek, ii. 172 *note*—contends that the pre-existence of a *miser* may as well be deduced from 2 Cor. viii. 9 as that of Christ, ii. 177, 178 *notes*—easily disposes in his own manner of all the texts that declare our Lord's pre-existence, ii. 178 *note*—compares the texts that declare our Lord's pre-existence to the stars in the firmament, ii. 179 *note*—gives a curious specimen of his notions of astronomy, *ibid.*—gives a curious specimen of his knowledge of the Greek language, ii. 181, 182 *notes*—blunders in plain English as well as in Greek, ii. 182 *note*—his extraordinary and self-contradictory notion of a mere man having miraculous powers at his own option, ii. 212–217—his singularly dishonest treatment of 1 Cor. xv. 47 exposed, ii. 234, 235 *notes*—his monstrous treatment of the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and his strange jumble of all that relates to *Angels*, *Spirits*, *and Heaven*, iii. 239–241 *notes*—objects strongly to *hierarchies* amongst angels, ii. 243 *notes*—professes himself to be neither a *materialist* nor an *immaterialist*, ii. 245 *note*—says that his true position is in the *centre of oscillation*, *ibid.*—manifestly ignorant of what the centre of oscillation means, *ibid.*—pretends to retract his avowed opinions both on *Materialism* and the *Sabbath*, in order to make proselytes, ii. 245, 246 *notes*.

Ben Mordecai, (H. Taylor,) his letters written with acuteness, i. 86—his scheme of Atonement, i. 13, 14—not free from a tincture of Socinian principles, i. 14. 118—different from that of Dr. Taylor of Norwich, i. 122—objects to the received doctrine of Atonement, its implication of the *divine implacability*, i. 15—answered on his own principles, i. 15–17. 122–124—objects without reason to Grotius, Stillingfleet, and Clarke, i. 124—objects to the doctrine of Atonement on the ground of a want of discoverable connexion between the means and the end, i. 16—answered, i. 16, 17. 130, 131—objects on the ground of the divine immutability, and of the texts which speak of man's *reconciliation to God*, i. 17, 18. 129—answered, i. 18, 19. 132—denies that the paschal lamb is referred to in calling Jesus the lamb of God, i. 140, 141—refuted, i. 141–143—endeavours to prove that the word ἱλασμὸς does not support the idea of *propitiation*, i. 143—shewn to be mistaken, i. 143, 144—his argument from the word καταλλαγὴ shown to be inconclusive, i. 157, 158—endeavours to prove that the phrase *for us*, cannot mean *in our stead*, i. 161—his argument shewn to be erroneous, i. 161–163. ii. 66, *and note*—attempts to deprive the *Levitical* atonement of all *propitiatory* import, and to represent it but as a ceremonial purification, i. 214—this notion refuted, i. 211–215—his arguments against the doctrine of atonement on the supposition of its implying the absurdity of a vicarious substitution, stated and answered, i. 229–236—his attempt to do away the force of the expression *bearing sins*, examined and refuted, i. 265–303—his theory of *Sacrifice*, i. 325, 326—shewn to be erroneous, i. 30.

Benson (Dr.)—admits that *bearing sins*, signifies *suffering the penalty due to them*, i. 296—his criticism on the word ἀναφέρω examined and refuted, i. 300–302.

Blayney (Dr.)—not consistent, i. 293.

Bolingbroke—supplies, without intending it, a good argument against certain mistaken views of the Mosaic institution, i. 485, 486—a short review of his character, and of his attempts to overturn Revelation, i. 497–504.

Brekell (Mr.)—his able refutation of Socinian sophistries, i. 135 *and note.*

Bryant (Jacob) — grounds of his opinion that Philo Judæus derived his knowledge from Christian sources, i. 182—his striking observations on the *Mystical Sacrifice of the Phœnicians*, i. 247-250.

Buchanan, (Dr. Claudius)—his *Memoir on the Expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India*, a work deserving most serious attention, i. 74-76 *notes*—it presents a melancholy view of the neglect of religion in India by the British, i. 74 *note*—exhibits a pleasing picture of the Church of *Malabar*, i. 75 *note*—represents that church as possessing the purity of the Protestant profession of Christianity transmitted to it from the Apostolic age, *ibid.*

Burgess (Bishop)—has given an excellent account of Unitarian management of Scripture, ii. 107, 108—his *Brief Memorial* deserves serious consideration, ii. 112 *note*—his excellent observations on the proofs of Christ's divinity derived from his own declarations, ii. 128 *note*—has well exposed the dishonest use of Schleusner's name by the Unitarians, ii. 125 *note*—also the dishonest use made by them of the names of Locke and Grotius, ii. 133 *note*, 175 *note*—also that of Dr. Clarke, ii. 294 *note*—has well exposed several of the Unitarian glosses, ii. 154 *note*—has made good observations on Mr. Belsham's argument against the existence of a local heaven, ii. 159 *note*—has ably exposed the Unitarian rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 47, ii. 235 *note*—has beaten down the attempt lately made to set up Dr. Priestley's arguments against Bishop Horsley, ii. 241 *note.*

Buxtorf,—his testimony respecting expiatory sacrifices among the Jews, i. 177, 178.

Campbell (Dr. A.)—his undeserved commendation of Bishop Warburton, i. 153, 154.

Catholic, — the appellation of, improperly conceded to the Papists, who arrogate it exclusively to themselves, ii. 456, 457.

Celsus—bears testimony to the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, ii. 87, 88.

Charges,—to the Clergy of the diocese of Raphoe, ii. 401-428—to the clergy of the archdiocese of Dublin at the primary visitation, 431-459—second charge to the clergy of Dublin, 463-498.

Charlotte (H. R. H. the Princess),—her high opinion of Archbishop Magee's Discourses on the Atonement, i. xxxvii.

Chatham (William Pitt, Earl of)—his erroneous character of the Thirty-nine Articles refuted, ii. 428.

Christian Observer—gives a just character of Dr. J. Taylor's "Key to the Apostolic Writings," ii. 31 *note.*

Chubb,—exhibits curious specimens of deistical arguments against Christianity, i. 86-90.

Church and State,—the principles of the union between, in Christian communities, explained, ii. 463—ground of that union, 464-468—its validity defended against the fiction of Warburton, 469-474—and the usurpations of Popery, 474-485.

Church of England and Ireland,—proved to be scriptural, ii. 485—catholic, 486—tolerant, 486-488—social, 489—loyal, 490-492—protestant, 492—statement of the points of difference between it and the Romish Church, 492-496.

Clare (John, Earl of)—sermon on the death of, ii. 375-384—his character, 385-392—his progress while at the University, 397.

Clergy,—importance of their attending to the rules and orders of the church, ii. 405-408—and to consistency of character, 409-411—their proper studies and pursuits, 412-415—responsibility of their of-

fice, 416, 417—their duties, as laid down in the ordination office, 432-435—line of conduct to be pursued by them, 438-442—evils of their officiating in other parishes than those to which they are appointed, 448-450—canons relating to them, 457, 458—observations on their property, 454, 455.

Cloppenburg's judicious remarks on the distinction between the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, i. 443.

Cocceius,—his remarks on "sins of ignorance," i. 220.

Commerce and Manufactures,—without religion, a source of corruption to national morals, ii. 320, 321.

Condillac (Abbé de)—his attempt to explain the natural rise and growth of language, i. 350, 351—followed by *Dr. Adam Smith* and *Mr. Dugald Stewart*, 352 *note*—his theory untenable, 350-353.

Confirmation,—design and importance of, ii. 404.

Corruption of human nature, i. 10. 101—fully examined by Leland, i. 101—eloquently described by Mr. Wilberforce, i. 102, 103—also by Mrs. Hannah More, 104—denied in a certain sense by the Wesleyan Methodists, as well as by the followers of Priestley, i. 104, 105. 109, 110.

Crellius,—his criticism on Isaiah liii. and particularly on the phrase *bearing sins*, fully examined, i. 265-303.

Cudworth (Dr.)—his remarks on the nature of the Passover, i. 193, 194.

Cumberland (Bishop)—opposes the idea of the Phœnician sacrifice being derived from the intended sacrifice of Isaac, i. 253 *note*—the particular impressions under which this writer engaged in the Review of *Sanchoniatho's* History disqualified him for the due discharge of the task, *ibid.*

Danzius,—his remarks on "sins of ignorance," i. 221 *note*.

Deist,—rejects totally the idea of a *Mediator*, i. 3—his objections apply equally to Natural as to Revealed Religion, i. 3-8—not a true philosopher, i. 3, 4—cannot prove from reason the sufficiency of repentance, i. 4, 5—well answered by Balguy, i. 62, 63—refuted by experience, shewing the necessity of a revelation on this head, i. 4-8. 65-85—his objections against a *Mediator* bear with equal force against *repentance* and *prayer*, i. 7—the error in all such reasonings, i. 7, 8. 90-92.

Dodson (Mr.)—his criticisms on Isaiah liii. and his endeavours to do away the force of the expression *bearing sins*, carefully examined, i. 259-303—commended, yet partial in his translation and commentary, i. 260, 261—refers in proof of the justness of his criticisms to writers who have given no proof, i. 269-272. 283-290.

Druids,— prevalence of human sacrifices amongst them, i. 68.

Dublin,—Dr. Magee elevated to the archdiocese of, i. l-lii—state of the diocese, and peculiar difficulties of his situation, lii-liv—delivers his primary charge, lv—the charge itself, ii. 431-459—observations on it, and on the hostility raised against him in consequence of it, i. lv-lvii. lx—second charge, ii. 463-498—address to the Divinity Students of the University of, i. lxxxv-xc.

Episcopius,—his accurate distinction between moral and ceremonial impurities, i. 212, 213.

Erasmus,—not always to be relied upon in his Greek criticisms, 193, 194.

Ernesti,—his remarks on the style of the New Testament, i. 153 *note*.

Evanson (Mr.)—charges the Evangelists with gross contradictions, i. 114—retains only the gospel of St. Luke, and but a part of that, *ibid.*

Fellowes (Mr.)—attacks most unwarrantably the doctrines and articles of the established church, ii

5-22—observations upon his writings, 23.
Female writers of modern times, who have contributed by their publications to the advancement of virtue and religion, ii. 39, 40 *note* c.
Figurative language,—nature of it, i. 163-165.
France,—awful effects of Atheism in, ii. 326-333.

Geddes (Dr.),—specimen of his respect for the writings, and of his qualifications as a translator, of the Old Testament, i. 318-321 *and notes*. ii. 65 *note*—instance of his grotesque rendering of certain words, i. 203—his absurd view of the sacrifices of the Hebrews as borrowed from the Egyptians, i. 320, 321—opposed and answered by Dr. Priestley, i. 321-323—his strange distinction between those whom he calls the *vulgar Papists* and the *vulgar Protestants*, i. 465, 466 *notes*.
George IV. — appoints Dr. Magee Dean of the Viceregal Chapel, at Dublin, i. xlviii—his reception of Archbishop Magee, and reply to the address of a deputation of Irish Bishops, against the Roman Catholic emancipation Bill, lxix, lxx.
Gospel—not hostile to patriotism, ii. 328—its silent influence on society, 329.
Graves (Rev. Dr.),—his character of Bishop Warburton, i. 484 *note*—his lectures on the pentateuch commended, i. 486.
Grotius,—his erroneous translation of Hebr. i. 2, i. 49—charged with Socinianism, i. 50—his extravagant application of the famous prophecy of Isaiah liii. to Jeremiah, i. 264—his strange notion concerning the nature of Abel's sacrifice, examined, and confuted, 437-440—his excellent remarks on the relation subsisting between the Mosaic and the Christian sacrifices, 470, 471—his annotations on the Epistles, not published till after his death, ii. 202 *note*—unfoundedly claimed by the modern Socinians as supporting their opinions, ii. 175 *note*.

Happiness—inseparable from religion and virtue, ii. 315-320.
Heath (Mr.),—the objections urged by him and others against the antiquity of the book of Job fully examined, i. 381-386.
Heidegger's interpretation of the passage in Gen. i. 29, 30, as a grant of animal food to Adam, shewn to be erroneous, i. 337-340.
Herder's Essay to explain the *natural* acquisition of language, admitted to be the best in support of that notion, and yet radically defective, i. 354, 355.
Hezekiah,—admonition to, by Isaiah, explained, and improved, ii. 377-382.
Holland (Lord),—severe but mild reproof of, by Archbishop Magee, i. lxvii.
Horsley (Bishop), — his able refutation of Dr. Priestley, i. 173, 174.
Houbigant,—his remarks on "sins of ignorance," i. 219.
Hume (David),—a short view of his character, and of his inveterate and impotent hostility against Revelation, i. 504-524—a dangerous guide in *history* as well as in *philosophy*, i. 518-523—his calumnies against Luther fully exposed, i. 520-522 *notes*.
Hurd (Dr.),—his well-known letter to Dr. Jortin, i. 154 *note*.

Ignatius (Saint) — affords strong testimony to the *authenticity* of the *first two chapters of St. Matthew*, ii. 91. 93. 103—nature of his allusions to Scripture, and of his writings generally, ii. 103, 104.
Indian records—falsely asserted to be prior to the *Mosaic writings*, i. 488-495 — dishonest attempt in the London Editors of the Asiatic Researches to advance their extrava-

gant claims to antiquity, i. 489 *and note.*

Ireland, — thanksgiving sermon, for the providential deliverance of, from invasion, ii. 353–371.

Jehovah, — untruly pronounced to have been expressed uniformly by Κύριος in the Septuagint, and never by Θεὸς, ii. 229, 230, *notes.*

Jews,—their notions concerning the state of the dead, unfolded in the explication of their terms Sheol and Rephaim, i. 411, 412 and 412–415 *in notes*—their extraordinary admission of a compact with the Father binding the Son to a vicarious suffering for the sins of men, ii. 24.

Job,—the reality of the history, and the date and author of the book, carefully considered, i. 370–437—various opinions on these heads, and their principal supporters, i. 370. 373–375. 396, 397—the book an inspired work, i. 394, 395—erroneous objections to the antiquity of the book of Job by Bishop Stock, and their confutation, i. 397–435—the history of Job handed down among the Arabians, i. 435–437.

Johnson (Dr. Samuel),—his character of Warburton, i. 484 *note.*

Josephus,—his testimony, as far as it goes, favourable to the notion of the *propitiatory* virtue of sacrifice, in opposition to the assertion made by Dr. Priestley upon that subject, i. 180, 181. 196—employs expressions which clearly mark the use of the word ἱλαστήριον among the Jews in a strict *propitiatory* sense, i. 144 *note* b.

Justin Martyr—quotes from *Ezra* an extraordinary passage relating to the Passover, i. 197, 198—affords ample testimony to the *authenticity* of the *first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel*, ii. 89, 90. 92. 94. 95–99.

Kennicott — prefers Coverdale's to our present version of the Bible, i. 276, 277—his criticisms on Hebr. xi. 4, not admissible, i. 444–450—mistakes the nature of the *Mincha*, i. 446–449.

Keschita,—the true meaning of this word considered, i. 378–380.

Language, — its origin from divine institution, i. 342–356—of the New Testament peculiar, i. 153 — opinions of *Capellus*, *Ernesti*, *Michaelis*, *Middleton*, *Warburton*, *Leland* and *Campbell* upon this subject, *ibid.*—*figurative* distinguished from *analogical*, i. 163, 164.

Leland (Dr. Thomas, of Trinity College, Dublin),—has best refuted the objections against the inspiration of the writers of the N. T. derived from their unclassical style, i. 153—an account of his writings, i. 153–156 *notes.*

Lepaux, — deism of, little different from Mr. Belsham's system of Christianity, i. 114—ii. 43, 44.

Life, uncertainty of, ii. 378–380.

Lowth (Bishop),—his fanciful notions respecting the passover, i. 203, 204.

Loyalty of the Church of England and Ireland, ii. 490–492.

Luther, — the calumnies circulated against him by Hume, exposed and refuted, i. 520–522 *notes.*

Magee (William, Archbishop of Dublin),—birth of, i. xi—notice of his parents, *ibid.*, xii—his early education, xiii–xvi — anecdotes of his childhood and youth, xviii–xx — enters the University of Dublin, xx—takes his first degree, xxi – his exemplary conduct, while at the university, xxii—his gratitude to his uncle, xxiii—elected fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, *ibid.*—his triumphant reception at Enniskillen, xxiv, xxv—his ordination, xxv—his marriage, xxvi—character of his lady, *ibid.*, xxvii—her de-

cease, xlvi—amiable character of Mr. Magee, as fellow of his college, xxvii, xxviii—and as a husband and parent, xxix, xxx. lxii—and as a master, lxiii, lxiv—his exemplary filial piety, xxx, xxxi—preaches his first sermon, xxxii—delivers the Donnellan lectures, xxxiv—and his discourses on the Atonement and Sacrifice, *ibid.*—interesting anecdote of the usefulness of that work, lxxix, lxxx—character of it, lxxx—Mr. Magee retires on two college livings, xxxv—his character and conduct as a parochial clergyman, xxxvi—liberality to the poor, *ibid.*—his work on the Atonement highly valued by the Princess Charlotte, xxxvii — political impediments to his promotion, *ibid.*, xxxviii—is appointed Dean of Cork, xxxix — his conduct there, *ibid.*—especially when assailed by the Papists, xl—Bishop Barrington's opinion of his conversational powers, xlii—Dean Magee appointed Bishop of Raphoe, xliii—letter of Mr. (now Sir Robert) Peel on that occasion, xlvi — and of the Lord Lieutenant, Earl Talbot, *ibid.* —his benevolence to Mr. Trotter, xliv—character of his charge to the clergy of Raphoe, xliii—his delicacy in administering reproof, xlvii —appointed by George IV. to the deanery of the viceregal chapel at Dublin Castle, xlviii — generous conduct of the Bishop of Meath to Dr. Magee, *ibid.*—Bishop Magee preaches before George IV., and is requested to publish the sermon, xlix—his humble sentiments concerning his discourses, l—proceedings respecting his elevation to the primacy, l, li—is appointed Archbishop of Dublin, lii—peculiar difficulties of his situation, lii, liii, liv—delivers his primary charge, lv—observations on it, and on the hostility with which he was assailed, lv-lvii. lx. lxx—steadiness of his friendship for Mr. (afterwards Lord Chancellor) Plunket, lvii, lviii—the Archbishop's high sense of duty, lix—his character vindicated against the scurrility of Taylor, lxi, lxii—his love of order, lxiv—success in treating and removing scruples of conscience, lxv, lxvi—his deep sorrow on the death of Mrs. Magee, lxviii—his severe but mild reproof of Lord Holland, lxvii —his benevolence to the poor of Dublin, lxxi—his visit to Mrs. Hannah More, lxxii-lxxiv — his declining health, last sickness, and peaceful death, lxxv-lxxviii—proximate cause of it, lxxix—notice of his family, lxxviii, lxxix.

Magee (Rev. John), — biographical notice of, i. lxv, lxvi.

Maimonides,—his notion of the origin of sacrifice, i. 170. 174, 175—his opinion of the book of Job followed by Le Clerc and Michaelis, i. 371—the origin of his celebrated work, the *Moreh Nevochim*, i. 483 *note* b — followed by *Spencer* and *Warburton*, i. 482-484.

Marsh (Rev. Dr. Digby),—character of, ii. 396.

Matthew (St.) — reconciled with Isaiah, i. 265-280—arguments relating to the authenticity of the first two chapters of his gospel, ii. 77-82. 87-106.

Mede, — his opinion that sacrifices were essentially *federal feasts*, i. 328-330—shewn to be ill founded, i. 330, 331—his excellent observation on those passages of Scripture which seem to depreciate sacrifices, i. 367.

Michaelis,—his exposition of the word ἱλαστήριον, i. 144 —his opinion of the Apostolical antiquity of the *old Syriac* version of the New Testament, i. 152 *note*—his objections against the reality of the history of Job examined, i. 373, 374—his arguments in support of the antiquity of the book, i. 384, 385.

Mickle's Enquiry into the Brahminical philosophy, i. 73, 74 *notes*.

Middleton (T. F., Bishop of Calcutta), —his observations on the language

of the New Testament, i. 153—his work on the Greek Article recommended, ii. 87.

Monboddo (Lord),—his strange theory of the origin of language, i. 349, 350.

More (Mrs. Hannah), — a distinguished and powerful advocate of virtue and religion, ii. 39 *note* c—quoted on the subject of human corruption, i. 103, 104—her just and beautiful observations on *Hume's History*, i. 519–523 — account of Archbishop Magee's visit to her, i. lxxii, lxxiii.

Morgan,—his absurd idea of the origin of Sacrifice, i. 29. 314, 315.

Nares (Dr.),—his *Bampton Lecture* a valuable work, i. 493, 494 *notes*—his *Remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament* referred to, i. 307, 308 *notes*. ii. 67. 86, and in many other places—the cause of Christianity much indebted to him, i. 308 *note*, 493, 494 *notes*.

O'Beirne (Dr., Bishop of Meath),—generous conduct of, towards Dr. Magee, i. xlviii, xlix.

Outram,—his work *De Sacrificiis* deserves to be particularly consulted on the Sacrificial doctrine of the Rabbins, i. 169. 231. 236. 238.

Ovid,—his testimony respecting the expiatory nature of sacrifice among the Heathens, i. 188, 189.

Parr (Dr.)—unguardedly commends *Mr. Fellowes's* writings, ii. 21–23—his eloquent eulogium on Dr. Priestley, ii. 49 *note*—his defence of Dr. Thomas Leland, i. 155 *note*.

Passover,—an accurate discussion of the meaning of the original word, i. 196. 199–207—shewn to be a sacrifice, i. 192–199—extraordinary passage relating to it in *Justin Martyr*, i. 197, 198.

Peel (Sir Robert),—letter of, to Dr. Magee, i. xlvi.

Perceval (Rt. Hon. Spencer)—patronizes Mr. Magee, i. xxxvi. xxxviii.

Percival, (Dr.) — a distinguished writer, ii. 42 *note*—his excellent remarks on *Providence* and *Prayer*, *ibid.*—valuable observations on the *Origin of Evil*, the *Evidence of Christianity*, and the *Clerical character and conduct*, *ibid.*—Memoir of his Life and Character by his son, Dr. Edward Percival, ii. 43 *note*.

Philo Judæus,—not accurately versed in Jewish customs, i. 181, 182. 187–195 — his mistake respecting the nature of the passover, i. 195—holds a number of doctrines, and particularly those of a *Mediator* and *propitiation*, that closely resemble the Christian doctrines, i. 182–187—supposed by Bryant to have derived his knowledge from the first Christians, i. 182—this notion opposed by Allix, i. 182.

Plunket (Rt. Hon. W. C., afterwards Lord Plunket),—early friendship of Archbishop Magee for, i. xvi, xvii—its unbroken continuance, xli, xlii. lvii, lviii — dedication of his Dissertations on the Atonement to him, lxxxiii, lxxxiv.

Popish writers,—of the present day, not entitled to serious consideration, i. 462–465.

Porteus (Bishop),—his Sermons on the *Christian Doctrine of Redemption*, excellent, i. 86.

Pre-existence,—texts supporting, i. 48, 49—arguments against, by Grotius, i. 49—by modern Socinians in general, i. 50–56—by Mr. Lindsey, i. 51—by Mr. Tyrwhitt, i. 52—by Mr. Wakefield, i. 54. 56, 57—by Socinus, i. 55—defended against the above objectors, i. 47–53.

Price (Dr.),—his strange opinion concerning *Universals*, i. 347 *note*—offers some excellent observations on the compatibility of the efficacy of prayer with the divine immutabi-

lity, i. 90, 91—also on the efficacy of *intercession* with the Deity, i. 93, 94—remarks likewise on the beneficial influence of intercessionary prayer on the mind of him who offers it, i. 95-97—to be lamented that such a man should in some points have departed so far from Scripture truth, i. 97.

Priestley (Dr.),—his irreverent language concerning the sacred writers, i. 59. 113, 114. 166, 167. 265—pronounces it indispensable to his scheme to overturn the received doctrine of Atonement, i. 61, 62—his boldness of assertion respecting historical facts relating to the character of the Deity, i. 80-85—his historical incompetency fully established, i. 65-85—his incompetency as a reporter of the Rabbinical opinions and writings, i. 166-180—his gross misstatement of their writings, and of those of Philo and Josephus, i. 186-188—his extraordinary power of modifying and applying the testimonies of ancient writers, i. 169-187—seems as little conversant with classical as with historical writers, i. 188—considers the death of Christ in the same light with that of any other good man, i. 100, 101—misrepresents the arguments in support of the doctrine of atonement, i. 112. 306, 307—charges the sacred writers as ignorant and blundering, i. 113, 114 boasts of having no fixed creed, i. 116—instances of his mode of evading the force of Scripture authority, i. 127, 128. 145. 159, 160—directly misstates the book of Job, i. 138, 139—his unjustifiable inaccuracy in Scripture criticism shewn in his remarks on two important passages, Isaiah liii. 10, and 2 Cor. v. 21, i. 146-156—his strange explication of the words *for* and *instead*, i. 159, 160—confesses that he *forces* the language of Scripture, i. 164, 165—contradicts himself, i. 166, 167—his rejection of the attribute of *Justice* for the purpose of proving the sufficiency of repentance without any other consideration, i. 139, 140—his principles go to exclude all punishment whatever, i. 140—denies that the Passover was a *sacrifice*, i. 192—convicted by the direct words of Scripture, and all his arguments on this head shewn to be plainly contradictory to truth, *ibid.*, 193—Passover on the contrary proved to be a sacrifice, i. 192-196—his endeavours to prove that the *Levitical* atonement contained no idea of *propitiation*, but merely implied ceremonial purification, i. 309, 310—seems not to have attended to the original word כִּפֶּר, signifying atonement, i. 210-212—fallacy of his argument, i. 211—confuted, i. 211-215—his assertion that no trace of the doctrine of atonement is to be found in either New or Old Testament, shewn to be totally unfounded, i. 303, 304—his assertion that no trace of the *principle* of atonement is to be found in Scripture, refuted, i. 306—his assertion that the doctrine of atonement sinks our ideas of the divine mercy, refuted, i. 312-314—maintains, in opposition to Geddes, that the Mosaic sacrifices were not borrowed from the heathens, but had a divine origin, i. 321-323—in this he contradicts himself, i. 323, 324 his theory of *sacrifice*, i. 325—his reason for denying, in opposition to accumulated facts, that the notion of expiatory sacrifice had ever obtained amongst the heathens, i. 359,360—his private character and talents, ii. 49-51—his public conduct censurable, ii. 50—restrained by early habits, ii. 55—his religious opinions less exceptionable as he advanced in life, i. 324—his uncharitable animadversions on the established clergy, ii. 56, 57 *notes*—affirms that Unitarians never become Deists, ii. 57—is directly contradicted by fact, ii. 58—gives such an account of the nature of Academies of the Unitarian description, as proves the pro-

gress to infidelity to be almost unavoidable, ii. 53, 54 *notes*—his theory of Early Opinions entirely overturned by *Mr. Wilson's Illustration, &c.*, ii. 129 *note*.

Providential government of God,—explained and vindicated, ii. 355–367.

Public Spirit,—without religion, no sufficient safeguard to a nation, ii. 322.

Purgatory,—advocated by Mr. Belsham, ii. 30. 35.

Quarterly Review,—an excellent article contained therein on the subject of the *Missions to India*, i. 76 *note*—its just observations on the nature of *Socinianism*, ii. 55, 56 *note*.

Rabbins,—full account of their opinions on the subject of the *sacrificial Atonement*, proving that they considered sacrifices not only as generally *expiatory*, but as strictly *vicarious*, i. 168–178—the notion entertained by some of them of the human origin of sacrifice accounted for, i. 177.

Randolph (Dr.),—his just observations on the divine origin of sacrifice, i. 245 *note* a.

Raphelius,—his just remarks on the *vicarious* nature of the sufferings of Christ, i. 162 *and note*.

Raphoe,—Dr. Magee appointed to the see of, i. xlii. xlvi—his charge to the clergy of that diocese, ii. 401–428—character of it, i. xliii—his delicate mode of reproving one of the clergy of that diocese, xlvii., xlviii.

Rational Christian—his philosophic lights, ii. 37. See *Unitarians*.

Rational Dissenters,—Unitarians so distinguish themselves from the other classes of non-conformists, i. 97, 98. ii. 63 *note* a. See *Unitarian*.

Redemption,—Scriptural doctrine of, naturally to be rejected by unassisted reason, i. 1—principle of combated by Socinians with peculiar vehemence, i. 61, 62—in the highest degree necessary to defend it, i. 2, 3. 61—arguments relating to it misrepresented by Dr. Priestley, i. 15. 112. 306, 307—misrepresented by H. Taylor and others, i. 123, 124. 127—scheme of, held by the Unitarians, i. 8, 9—held by B. Mordecai, i. 13—held by Dr. J. Taylor, of Norwich, i. 118–121—the doctrine objected to, as implying divine implacability, i. 14—objection answered, i. 15, 16—objected to, for want of *connexion* between the means and the end, i. 16, 17—objection answered, *ibid.*, 130–132—objected to, on account of the Scripture phrase of *our being reconciled to God*, i. 17—objection answered, *ibid.*, 132–134—objected to, on the ground of the divine benevolence, and of the stress laid on this attribute everywhere through Scripture, i. 19. 139—objection answered, i. 18, 19. 135–140—nature of the Redemption fully opened up by Isaiah, i. 263–298—advantageous effects of the scheme of Redemption upon the mind, i. 26—the full comprehension of the principle on which it is founded, impeded by the same difficulty which attaches to other parts of human knowledge, i. 132. See *Atonement*.

Religion and virtue,—inseparable from happiness, ii. 315 *et seq*.

Richie (Dr.)—refutes Dr. Sykes's theory of *sacrifice*, in his *Criticism on Modern Notions of Sacrifice*, i. 328—furnishes an excellent refutation of *Dr. J. Taylor's* scheme of *Atonement*, i. 121, 122—his remarks on "sins of ignorance," i. 220—particularly recommended on the subject of the *origin* of sacrifices, i. 368.

Roman Catholic,—import of the term, ii. 457.

Romish Church,—points of difference between it and the church of England and Ireland, ii. 492–496—the appellation of Catholic improperly conceded to it, 456, 457.

Rosenmüller,—his just remarks on the nature of the passover, i. 204—his remarks on "sins of ignorance," i. 220, 221.
Rubric,—importance of the clergy attending to, ii. 405-407.

Sacrifice,—human, general throughout the ancient world, i. 65-85—deemed strictly *vicarious* by the heathens, i. 138—heathen sacrifice a corruption of the rite divinely instituted, i. 244-246—a striking instance of this in the *Mystical sacrifice of the Phœnicians*, i. 246-252—contended that the death of Christ was not a *propitiatory sacrifice*, i. 19—answered, i. 20-22. 144-156—objected that under the *Law* there was no propitiatory sacrifice whatever, i. 20, 21. 166, 167—objection answered, i. 21-24. 207-215—the sacrifice of Christ, though spoken of in language *seemingly figurative*, intended as a *real* and *efficacious* sacrifice, i. 163-165—inconsistency of those who hold the death of Christ to have been but figuratively called a sacrifice, i. 24. 310, 311—*that* the only true and real sacrifice, the sacrifices of the *law* being all but figurative of *it*, i. 31, 32. 475, 476—passover proved to be a sacrifice, and the nature and meaning of this sacrifice explained, i. 192-199—sense in which the notion of *vicarious* is to be applied to sacrifices in general, i. 23. 227, 228—vicarious *import* of the sacrifices of the law, expressed by the ceremony of the *imposition of hands*, i. 236. 238—more strongly marked by the ceremony of the *Scape-Goat*, i. 238, 239—*Sacrifice for Sin* defined, i. 24—means of *reconciliation* by Sacrifice explained, i. 25—not inconsistent with the divine dignity and attributes, i. 25, 26—Sacrifice of Christ differs from all other sacrifices in one important particular, i. 26—nature of Christ's sacrifice usually examined in an erroneous method, i. 29—supporters of the *human invention* of sacrifice, i. 290—theories of it: by Spencer, i. 29, 30. 324—by the Author of *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, i. 324, 325—by Dr. Priestley, i. 325—by B. Mordecai, i. 325—by Sykes, i. 29, 30. 326—by Warburton, i. 29, 30. 331—general heads of argument against all the theories of human invention of sacrifices, i. 30—only true mode of discovering the origin and nature of the rite, i. 31—the rite *unnatural* in the view of unassisted reason, i. 356—an argument hence in favour of *divine institution*, i. 359, 360—the rite *universally* practised, an argument in favour of *divine institution*, i. 357, 358—brief view of the Christian sacrifice, i. 31, 32—*objections* against the divine origin of sacrifice examined, i. 360-365—*divine origin* inferred from Abel's and the early patriarchal sacrifices, i. 32, 33. 367-369—the sacrifice of Abel an *animal* sacrifice, i. 437-440—divine origin and true design of sacrifice inferred from the sacrifice of Abel, i. 33-39—sacrifice of Abel, why accepted, whilst that of Cain was rejected, i. 33-38. 441-449—rite instituted at the fall, i. 34. 454-457—the animal sacrifice peculiarly significant, i. 35—sacrifices before the law, *animal* and *piacular*, i. 36-39. 245, 246. 468-470—true import of the early animal sacrifices before and under the law, i. 245, 246—history of Scripture sacrifice shown to be consistent throughout, i. 39-41—the sacrifice, of those under the law, most particularly typical and illustrative of that of Christ, i. 41, 42. ii. 1, 2—sacrifice of Christ, in what sense, and how far, *vicarious*, i. 43.
Scripture Account of Sacrifices, Author of,—his scheme of *Redemption*, i. 131—his singular notion concerning the pollution of the Scape-Goat, &c., i. 241—refuted, i. 225—admits that *bearing sin*, means bearing its punishment, in the case of one's *own*

sin, but not in that of *another's*, i. 292 — answered, i. 292–295 — his scheme of the origin and meaning of sacrifice, and the objection to it, i. 324, 325.

Septuagint translation of Isaiah, inferior to that of any other part of the Old Testament, i. 150—the translation of Job also inaccurate, and takes great liberties with the original, i. 401 *note*, col. 2—collation of the various copies of the Septuagint by Dr. Holmes, i. 62, 63 *notes*.

Sharp (Granville)—has, in his *letter on certain particularities of the Hebrew Syntax*, made some excellent remarks on the *converted future* of the *Hebrew*, i. 391 *note*.

Smith (Dr. Adam)—argues from the natural sentiments of mankind, in behalf of the reasonableness of *intercession* and *atonement*, i. 136, 137—infected by his connexion with David Hume, i. 137, 138. 510 *note*—his opinion of the process whereby the use of general signs is acquired, controverted, i. 352 *note*.

Smith (Elizabeth),— her translation of the book of Job, an extraordinary work, i. 419 *note*—extracts from and observations on that translation, *ibid.*, 420 *note*—praise of her by Mrs. Hannah More, ii. 40 *note*.

Socinians distinguished from *Unitarians*, i. 99–101. 115 *notes*—their mode of interpreting Scripture described, i. 114. 123, 124.

Spencer,—his error concerning the nature and origin of sacrifice, i. 316. 324—his wrong interpretation of the ἰθελοθρησκία of St. Paul, i. 316 *note*—his argument derived from the use of the word δῶρα in Heb. xi. 4. refuted, *ibid.*—his work built upon the *Moreh Nevochim* of *Maimonides*, i. 482, 483—a dangerous guide in theology, 483—refuted by several writers, i. 482. 485, 486—his reflections upon divine Revelation, i. 483 *note*.

Stock (Dr., Bishop of Killala)—objects to the generally received idea of the antiquity of the book of Job, i. 305–307—his objections shown to be unfounded, i. 307–404—his translation of Job, a hasty, imperfect, and highly objectionable performance, i. 432. 434—indulges too freely in conjectural emendations of the sacred text, i. 432–435.

Students at Trinity College, Dublin, addresses to, i. lxxxv–xc. ii. 368–370. 393, 394.

Sykes objects to the doctrine of atonement on the ground of texts stating *man's reconciliation to God*, not that of *God to man*, i. 133—states the texts uncandidly, i. 134—his whole objection answered, i. 17–19. 131–135—his erroneous criticism on the phrase "*for us*," i. 160–163—contradicts himself in his endeavours to prove, that Christ, when compared to the Paschal lamb, was not said to be sacrificed, i. 199—his arguments against the doctrine of atonement, on the ground of its implying vicarious substitution, stated and answered, i. 229–236—his affirmation, that the imposition of hands implied nothing vicarious, considered, i. 238–241—his denial that the scape-goat was a sin-offering, examined, i. 239–241. 297, 298—refers to a text as proving decisively that נשא signifies *removing* or *taking away*, which makes directly against him, i. 290—his theory of *sacrifice*, i. 30. 326—shown to be erroneous, i. 30. 326–331. 333–342—contends for the permission of animal food before the Flood, 334—this notion refuted, 333–342.

Talbot (Earl, Lord Lieutenant),—letter of, to Dr. Magee, announcing his elevation to the episcopate, i. xliv—letter requesting the publication of his sermon preached before George IV., xlix.

Taylor (Henry). See *Ben Mordecai*.

Taylor (Dr. John, of Norwich),—his scheme of atonement, i. 118–121—falls in with some of the principles of the Socinian, i. 118. 121, 122—his whole scheme but an artful

accommodation of Scripture phrases, i. 118. 121—his *key* a false one, ii. 31—his works imprudently recommended by Bishops, i. 121—the errors of his scheme fully refuted by the author of the *Scripture Account of Sacrifices*, and by *Dr. Richie's Criticisms on Modern Notions of Atonement*, *ibid.*—and well pointed out in the *Christian Observer*, ii. 31 *note*—difference between his scheme and that of H. Taylor, i. 122—his familiar illustration of his scheme, i. 130—his unjustifiable mode of investigating the nature of the *Levitical* atonement, i. 208, 209—his endeavour to do away the force of the phrase, *bearing sins*, fully examined, i. 265–303—his erroneous criticism on the word נשא and the weakness of his endeavour to show that it merely signifies *removal*, and not *sustaining the penal consequences*, of sin, i. 280–289—is referred to by Mr. Belsham, but turns out too orthodox for him, and is afterwards relinquished by him, ii. 66, 67 *notes*.

Texts of Scripture—supporting the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, i. 48, 49—texts proving the plan of atonement to have arisen out of the divine *mercy*, i. 15, 16—texts, wrongly urged by Priestley, Sykes, and Taylor, in proof of the sufficiency of obedience *per se*, i. 126, 127—texts representing man as forgiven *freely*, how to be understood, i. 127–130—texts representing us as *reconciled to God*, not God as *reconciled to us*, misunderstood by Crellius, Sykes, H. and J. Taylor, and others, i. 18. 132–134—texts proving the displeasure of God against the sinner, explained, i. 18, 19. 135–213—texts proving the death of Christ to have been a *propitiatory sacrifice*, i. 19, 20. 146. 255, 256—texts proving the sacrifice of Christ to resemble the paschal sacrifice, i. 192–199—texts proving that atonement, in the Old Testament, included the idea of averting the divine displeasure, and obtaining forgiveness, i. 213, 214—two important texts cleared from the erroneous criticisms of Dr. Priestley, i. 145–156—celebrated one in Isaiah liii. particularly examined, and its application by St. Matthew vindicated, i. 256–298—texts ascribing the *bearing of sins* to Christ's sacrifice, and explaining the manner in which this phrase is used in Scripture, i. 255–298—texts in Isaiah liii. fully explanatory of the doctrine of atonement, i. 256–263. 296–300—text in 1 Pet. ii. 24 erroneously referred to Isaiah liii. 4, i. 266. 299, 300—texts announcing the principle of atonement, i. 299. 304—texts proving the sacrifices of the *law* to be typical of that of Christ, i. 31, 32—texts erroneously supposed to support the idea of the human invention of sacrifices, 349–353—text proving Abel's sacrifice to have had a reference to that of Christ, i. 33—text in Gen. iv. 7 explained, i. 36—texts evincing the piacular virtue of the animal sacrifice, i. 37, 38—texts referred to by *Justin Martyr* and the *Apostolical Fathers*, ii. 95–97—texts instanced, in which the Unitarian Version of the New Testament has departed from Primate Newcome without notice, and which bear vitally upon the Unitarian question, ii. 116, 117—these and other texts which are disingenuously treated by the Unitarians, considered, ii. 117–246—index of texts explained or referred to, ii. 501–514.

Tillotson's (Archbishop) unjustifiable idea of the origin of the plan of redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, i. 476–478—confuted, i. 478–484—his mistaken supposition of a *Religion of Nature*, *ibid. and notes*—his writings recommended by Locke, as supplying a model of *perspicuity*, 476 *note*.

Tindal—his absurd objection, i. 31. 314—the use to which it may be applied, 315.

Tolerance of the church of England and Ireland, ii. 486–488.

Tomline (Bishop)—on Philip. ii. 6, 7, deserves particularly to be consulted, i. 47—his judicious reflections on the endeavours of the Christian after perfection, i. 108 *note*—his excellent observations on subscription to the *Articles of the Church*, ii. 16.

Townson (Dr.)—gives a good account of St. Matthew's peculiar mode of citing the prophecies, i. 280.

Trimmer (Mrs.)—a book falsely published under her name by the Unitarians, in order to introduce their heresy into schools, ii. 296, 297 *notes*.

Unitarians—brief view of their scheme, i. 8, 9—their notion of the sufficiency of the *promulgation* of forgiveness on repentance, erroneous, i. 9–11—adopt a principle of reasoning in common with the Deist, i. 8—are equally unassailable, on the ground of Scripture, with the Deist, i. 11—their strange explication of texts of Scripture, i. 50–57. ii. 29 73—mode of reasoning subversive of every possible interpretation of Scripture, i. 58, 59. 114, 115—called by Mr. *Howes*, *Humanists*; and by Mr. *Hobhouse*, *Humanitarians*, i. 98—favourers of Mahometanism, i. 88, 89—pretend to be exclusively worshippers of *one God*, i. 97. ii. 30—their scheme fully explained by Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, but most compendiously by the latter, i. 98. ii. 29–32. 68–70 *and notes*—their scheme difficult to describe, why, ii. 29, 30—they disclaim the title of *Socinians*, i. 99—go far beyond Socinus, i. 99–101. ii. 39 *and notes*—explain away the meaning of Scripture, i. 12, 13. 58, 59. 113 116—represent the Sacred Writers as erroneous and unphilosophical, i. 113, 114—differ little from the *Theophilanthrope* Deists, i. 114. ii. 44—cannot form any canon of Scripture, why, i. 116—nature of their version of the New Testament, ii. 74–86—in that version admit the substitutive force of the word ἀντὶ, i. 162 *note*—reject *humility*, i. 12. 104—agree with the Stoics in their proud notions of virtue, i. 117, 118—refer to each other boldly for proofs which have not been given, i. 270–272. 289, 290. ii. 64—said to hold a *pure* Christianity, ii. 48—said to be persecuted, *ibid.*—falsely said to be a progressive cause, ii. 52—likely to decrease in number, *ibid.* 55—do not all follow up their principles, ii. 54, 55—in one way *seem* to increase in number, ii. 56—naturally pass to Deism, ii. 53, 54. 58—how they contrive to retain the Bible, ii. 59—they alone sound critics, and why, ii. 60—disingenuous in their treatment of ancient authorities, ii. 92, 93—avowedly reject the received use of language, ii. 108 *note*—deprecate the application of critical learning to Scripture, and why, 109 *note*—dishonestly desert Primate Newcome in their version, ii. 116. 246 *note*—make a capricious use of the Greek article to establish their own doctrines, ii. 117–126—make a dishonest use of Schleusner's authority, ii. 124 *note*—have adopted an organization similar to the Wesleyan, ii. 112. 306—their mode of interpreting Scripture, ii. 129–132 *and notes*—have contrived an expedient whereby they can in terms *appear* to admit those doctrines of Scripture which they reject, ii. 146, 147 *notes*—make an unguarded confession of their dishonest artifices for this purpose, *ibid.*—quote Erasmus, Grotius, Clarke, Griesbach, Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom, all unfairly, ii. 163–167 *notes*—cite Locke's authority unfairly, ii. 168, 169 *notes*—employ such criticism as the old Socinians would have been ashamed of, ii. 171 *note*—put in an unfounded claim to the support of Locke and Grotius, ii. 175 *note*—not very fortunate in their references to the ancient Classics, ii. 195 *note*—substitute the "wilderness" for the

" heaven " into which the old Socinians fancied our Lord to have been carried up after his baptism, ii. 214 *note*—do not follow Griesbach, though they profess to do so, ii. 226 *note*—libel Marcion, whom they profess to admire, ii. 227 *note*—have grossly misrepresented Dr. Clarke, ii. 238–240 *notes*—the religion of Unitarians not the religion of truth, ii. 246–250—the absurdity of their arguments (especialy those of Mr. Belsham) in opposition to the genuineness of the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke, fully exposed, ii. 250–288—the indecency of their manner of treating grave subjects and persons, instanced in Mr. Belsham and Mr. Gilchrist, ii. 256, 257 *notes*—their blasphemous treatment of subjects the most awful, ii. 257, 258 *notes*—the credulity of illiterate Unitarians sadly abused by their popular writers, especially by Mr. Belsham, ii. 277–279 *notes*—to be distinguished into different classes, ii. 284 *note*. 292. 300–302—their attempt to defend (by the pen of Mr. Belsham) their blunder concerning Herod, King of Judea, exposed, ii. 284–289—not so ignorant with regard to Ephrem Syrus, of the *sixth* century, as they pretend to be, ii. 291, 292—their studiously dishonest use of a title which they admit does not properly belong to them, ii. 292–305—their false reports of distinguished individuals, and their fabrications of writings under false names, to gain proselytes, ii. 293–298 *notes*—have made no progress in Ireland, and but little in America, ii. 293–299—the true Priestleyan Unitarians confessed by Mr. Belsham to be few in number, ii. 305 *note*—thay call upon all Dissenters to unite and overturn the Established Church, ii. 306, 307—have adopted the unnatural plan of sending abroad *missionaries* to teach *unbelief*, ii. 307.

Unitarian Version of the New Testament—of a latitude which embraces opinions subversive of Christian doctrines, ii. 74, 75—insidiously professes to found itself on Archbishop Newcome's translation, ii. 75—effected by means of the usual apparatus of Unitarian exposition, *ibid.*, 420—avows the design of clearing away all the leading doctrines of the Gospel, *ibid.*—is enabled to take the widest liberties of translation by its systematic rejection of verbal criticism, ii. 76. 109 *note*—gets rid of the doctrine of the *Incarnation* by rejecting the opening chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, ii. 76—futile and contradictory grounds on which it attempts to maintain this rejection, *ibid.*, 80, 81—quotes Lardner's authority in support of the opposite of that which he maintains, ii. 81, 82—does this from a gross blunder in confounding the *true* and *vulgar* eras of the *nativity*, ii. 82—falls into another blunder concerning the *age* and *character* of *Ephrem Syrus*, ii. 83—gives a most extraordinary and absurd translation of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, ii. 84—gives an equally extraordinary and absurd explanation of St. Stephen's address to Christ, ii. 85—the whole of this *new Version* judiciously examined and exposed by Dr. Nares, i. 308 *note*. ii. 86. 108, 109—also by Dr. Laurence and Mr. Rennell, ii. 109—proved to be grossly dishonest in its use of the Archbishop's name, ii. 112. 249 *note*—its extraordinary use of the terms THE *Son of God* and A *Son of God*, ii. 117–120 *notes*—its absurd interpretation of Luke i. 35 fully exposed, ii. 117–134—its absurd interpretation and exposition of Rom. i. 1, 2 exposed, ii. 129–133 *notes*—its unscriptural observations on *the two natures* in Christ opposed to the authorities of Locke and Grotius, ii. 132 *note*—its erroneous exposition of John i. 12 exposed, ii. 135–147 *and notes*—its

erroneous exposition of John x. 18 exposed, ii. 135–138—its erroneous exposition of John iii. 13 exposed, ii. 148–160 — its extraordinary glosses upon John iii. 13, iii. 31, vi. 38, and vi. 62, exhibited, ii. 152, 153 *notes*—its erroneous exposition of Rom. ix. 5 exposed, ii. 161–174—its disingenuous manner of speaking of the text in 1 Tim. iii. 16 noticed, ii. 161 *note*—its erroneous exposition of 2 Cor. viii. 9 exposed, ii. 176–220—its dishonest quotation of Wakefield, ii. 189–191 *notes*—its extraordinary exposition of Heb. xii. 25, 26 exposed, ii. 220–244 *notes*—its extraordinary treatment of 1 Cor. x. 9 exposed, ii. 223–232 *notes*—its unjustifiable treatment of 1 Cor. xv. 47 exposed, ii. 234–237 *notes*—its strange jumble of all that relates to angels, spirits, and heaven, and especially in the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 242–244 *notes*—a mere travesty of the New Testament, ii. 107—the probable reason for adopting Primate Newcome's Version for its basis, in preference to Wakefield's, ii. 237 *note*. 246 *note*—follows the Primate with servility where Unitarian tenets are not affected, ii. 246–248 *notes*—copies even his mistakes in such places faithfully, *ibid.*—The reason for selecting the Primate's Version openly confessed, ii. 248, 249 *notes*.

Universals—the various opinions concerning their nature, i. 343–348 *notes*—Aristotle's views on this subject, just, i. 343, 344 *note*—excellent remark upon this subject, by Mr. Dugald Stewart, i. 345 *note*.

Veysie (Mr.)—his judicious remarks on the sense in which God is said to forgive men *freely*, i. 130—his just distinction on the subject of figurative allusion, i. 163–165.

Villers—gives, in his *Essay on the Reformation*, a dismal account of the ignorance of Scripture enforced by the Romish Church, i. 463 *note*—contrasts the characters of the Protestant and Romish Churches, *ibid.*, 464 *note*—convicts Hume of falsehoods in his charges against Luther, i. 520 *note*.

Viridet (Rev. Mr.)—his generous treatment of Mr. Magee, i. xix, xx.—Mr. Magee's gratitude to him, xxiii.

Vitringa,—his erroneous notions respecting the passover, i. 200. 203–205.

Walker (Mr.)—has given, in his *Letter to Mr. Belsham*, an excellent refutation of his reasoning, ii. 31.

Warburton (Bishop),—his strange position that repentance must necessarily *entitle* to forgiveness, i. 64. 479 *note*—his singular theory on the subject of Natural Religion, i. 478–480 *notes*—his well-founded observations on Wesley, i. 110 *note*—his paradoxical position concerning the language of the New Testament, i. 153 *note*—this well refuted by Dr. Leland, *ibid.*, 154 *note*—his idea of the *scenical* nature of the intended sacrifice of *Isaac*, i. 253 *note*—his theory of *Sacrifice*, i. 30. 331—his objections against the divine institution of sacrifice considered, i. 360–364—his extravagant notion concerning the book of Job, i. 375—his unjustifiable adoption of the opinions of *Spencer* and *Maimonides*, i. 482–484—his severe castigation of Bolingbroke, i. 499—characters given of him by Dr. Johnson, 484 *note*—and by Dr. Graves, *ibid.*

Ward's Errata—a meagre abstract of Gregory Martin's ancient refuted work, i. 464 *note*—its recent republication a proof of the low state of Scripture Criticism in the Romish Church, *ibid.*—specimen of its miserable cavils against the Protestant translations of the Bible, *ibid.*, 465 *note*—answered by Dr. Ryan and Mr. Grier, i. 465 *note*—the danger to which these gentlemen are exposed by their attempts to answer it, *ibid.*

Wardlaw (Dr.),—his just observations on the Unitarian exposition of Rom. ix. 5, ii. 174 *note*—his excellent remarks on the Unitarian notion of a mere man possessing divine power, ii. 205—his just exposure of Mr. Belsham's absurd reasoning, ii. 257, 258 *notes*.

Watson (Bp. of Landaff),—his judicious observation on the position that the doctrine of *Atonement* is inconsistent with the divine attribute of mercy, i. 312 *note*—his just expression of indignation against the presumption of opposing a fancied philosophy to Apostolic authority, ii. 71, 72 *notes*.

Watts (Dr.),—his memory traduced by the Unitarians, ii. 295 *note*—and publications falsely issued by them as his, ii. 296, 297 *notes*.

Wesley (John),—his followers hold opinions of *perfection* inconsistent with *Christian humility*, i. 104 *note*—speak contemptuously of the Clergy of the Established Church, *ibid.*—not remarkable for the justness and accuracy of their reasonings, i. 105—their numbers rapidly increasing, and the reason why, *ibid.*—danger to the Establishment from the injudicious countenance given to them by some of its members, i. 105, 106—change of the *Liturgy* and *Articles*, and rejection of the *Catechism*, two of the *Creeds*, and many of the *Psalms*, by *Mr. Wesley*, i. 106 *note*—the *Articles* rejected by him inconsistent with his favourite doctrine of *perfection*, and the rejection derogatory to the dignity of Christ, i. 106 *note*. 109 *and note*—extravagant dogmas maintained by him and his followers, i. 105—proofs of this in the writings of Mr. Wesley, i. 108-111—his latitudinarian principles respecting doctrines, i. 110—mischievous consequences to true religion, i. 111.

Wilberforce (Mr.), — his *Practical View*, a book of high value, i. 60. 101—defended against Dr. Parr, ii. 22 *note*—his eloquent description of the corruption of man's natural state, i. 102, 103—describes Unitarianism as a half way house to Infidelity, ii. 45.

Williams,—in his *Free Enquiry*, asserts that there are no *certain* references to the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, *till* the days of *Celsus*, ii. 89—this assertion refuted, *ibid.* 90—his strange assertion concerning the silence of the Apostolical fathers on those chapters fully examined and confuted, ii. 91-104—this writer exhibits a striking specimen of the disingenuousness of Unitarian critics, ii. 92, 93.

Young (Dr. Matthew, Bishop of Clonfert),—biographical notice of, ii. 395, 396.

III.

INDEX

OF

THE EDITIONS OF SUCH BOOKS

AS HAVE BEEN QUOTED BY A REFERENCE TO PAGES, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE MARKS, THROUGHOUT THE DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS ON THE ATONEMENT.

ABARBANEL, Exord. Comm. in Levit. à De Veil . . . Lond. 1683
Acosta, History of East and West Indies . . . . Lond. 1604
Account of the Life and Writings of Mrs. Trimmer . . Lond. 1814
Alberti Observationes Philologicæ . . . . . Lugd. 1725
Allix's Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church . . . Lond. 1690
Archæologia . . . . . Lond. 1770, &c.
Asiatic Researches . . . . . Lond. 1806-1811
Augustinus, De Civitate Dei . . . . . Francof. 1661
———— De Hæresibus (ed. Welchman) . . . Oxon. 1721

BALGUY's Essay on Redemption . . . . . Winch. 1785
Banier's Mythology, &c., of the Ancients . . . . Lond. 1739
Barbauld's (Mrs.) Remarks on Mr. Wakefield's Enquiry Lond. 1792
Barrett's Enquiry into the Origin of the Constellations Dublin, 1800
Barrington's Miscellanea Sacra . . . . . Lond. 1770
Batt on the Message from John the Baptist . . . Lond. 1789
Bayle's Dictionary . . . . . Lond. 1734
Beattie's Essay on the Nature of Truth . . . . Dublin, 1773
Beausobre and L'Enfant, New Version of St. Matthew's Gospel. Camb. 1790
Belsham's Calm Inquiry . . . . . Lond. 1811
———— Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind . Lond. 1801
———— Letters upon Arianism, &c. . . . . Lond. 1808
———— Review of Wilberforce's Treatise . . . Lond. 1798
Ben Mordecai's Apology, by H. Taylor . . . . Lond. 1784
Berkeley's Works . . . . . Dublin, 1784
Berriman's (J.) Moyer's Lecture . . . . . Lond. 1725
Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric . . . . . Lond. 1789
Bocharti Opera Omnia . . . . . Lugd. Batav. 1712
Bolingbroke's Philosophical Works . . . . . Lond. 1754
———— Works . . . . . Lond. 1754
Boyle Lectures . . . . . Lond. 1739

Brissonius de Regio Persarum Principatu . . . . Argent. 1710
Broughton's Dictionary of all Religions . . . . . Lond. 1742
Bruckeri Historia Critica Philosophiæ . . . . . Lips. 1766
Bryant's Observations relating to Antient History . . Camb. 1767
——— Philo Judæus . . . . . Camb. 1797
Buchanan's Memoir on an Ecclesiastical Establishment in India. Lond. 1805
——— —— Christian Researches in Asia . . . . . Camb. 1811
Bulli Opera . . . . . Lond. 1694
Burgess (Bishop), Brief Memorial . . . . . Durham, 1814
——— ———, The Bible, and nothing but the Bible . Carmarth. 1815
Burgh's Inquiry . . . . . York, 1788
Burnet's Life of Bedel . . . . . Lond. 1685
Butler's Analogy of Religion, &c. . . . . Lond. 1798
Buxtorfii Dissertationes Philol. Theolog. . . . . Basil. 1662
——— Synagoga Judaica . . . . . Basil. 1680

Cæsaris Opera . . . . . Lond. 1712
Calixti Scholæ Propheticæ, ab Ernesti . . . . . Quedlinb. 1713
Campbell's Four Gospels, &c. . . . . Aberd. 1803
Carpenter's (Dr. Lant) Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel (2d ed.) Lond. 1811
Capelli Critica Sacra . . . . . Paris. 1650
Chapellow's Commentary on Job . . . . . Camb. 1752
Cicero . . . . . Parisiis, 1684
Clarke's Works . . . . . Lond. 1738
——— Paraphrase, &c. (3d ed.) . . . . . Lond. 1717
Clavigero's History of Mexico . . . . . Lond. 1737
Clemens Romanus, by Wotton . . . . . Cant. 1718
Cloppenburg, Sacrif. Patriarch. Schola . . . . . Ludg. 1637
Costard's Two Dissert. on Kesitah and Hermes . . . Oxf. 1750
Coventry's Philemon to Hydaspes . . . . . Lond. 1753
Crellius, Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum . . . . . Irenop. 1656
Cudworth's Intellectual System . . . . . Lond. 1743
——— Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality. Lond. 1731
Cumberland's Sanchoniatho . . . . . Lond. 1720
Cyrilli Alexandrini contra Julianum . . . . . Lips. 1696

Dathii Opuscula . . . . . Lips. 1796
Dawson's Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity invalidated . Lond. 1803
De Dieu (Ludov.), Animadversiones in Vet. Test. . Lugd. Bat. 1648
Delaney's Revelation examined with Candour . . . . Dublin, 1732
De Rossi, Variæ Lectiones Veteris Testamenti . . . Parmæ, 1784
D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale . . . . . Maestr. 1776
Dodson's New Translation of Isaiah . . . . . Lond. 1790
——— Letter to Dr. Sturges . . . . . Lond. 1791

Edwards's Survey of the Methods of Religion . . . Lond. 1699
Ellis's Knowledge of Divine Things, &c. . . . . Lond. 1743
Elrington's Donnellan Lecture Sermons . . . . . Dub. 1796
Elsner, Observationes Sacræ . . . . . Traj. ad Rhen. 1720
Ennius . . . . . ed. Hess. 1707

Episcopii Opera Theologica . . . . . Lond. 1678
Ernesti Institutio Interpretis N. T. . . . . Lips. 1792
Erskine's Sketches and Hints of Church History . . . Edinb. 1790
Estlin's (Dr.) Unitarian Christian's Defence . . . . Bristol, 1815
Eusebii Demonstratio Evangelica . . . . . Colon. 1688
——— Præparatio Evangelica . . . . . Colon. 1688
Evanson's Dissonance of the Evangelists . . . . Ipswich, 1792
Exposure of the unwarrantable Liberties taken by Unitarians, &c. Glasgow, 1813

Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca . . . . . Hamb. 1705
——— Bibliotheca Latina . . . . . Hamb. 1708
——— Delectus Argumentorum, &c. . . . . Hamb. 1725
——— Lux Evangelii . . . . . Hamb. 1731
Farmer's Enquiry into the Temptation . . . . . Lond. 1761
Fellowes's Guide to Immortality . . . . . Lond. 1804
——— Picture of Christian Philosophy . . . . Lond. 1803
——— Religion without Cant . . . . . Lond. 1808
Fortuita Sacra . . . . . Roterod. 1726

Gataker de Novi Instrumenti Stylo . . . . . Lond. 1648
Geddes's Critical Remarks . . . . . Lond. 1800
Gillies's Aristotle's Ethics and Politics . . . . . Lond. 1804
Gisborne's Principles of Moral Philosophy . . . . Lond. 1790
Glassii Philologia Sacra . . . . . a Dathio. Lips. 1776
Goguet's Origin of Laws, &c. . . . . Edinb. 1775
Graves's Lectures on the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch Dublin, 1807
Gray's Key to the Old Testament . . . . . Dublin, 1792
Griesbachii Nov. Test. . . . . Lond. 1809
Gregory's Lowth's Lectures . . . . . Lond. 1787
Grey, Liber Jobi, à Schultens . . . . . Lond. 1742
Grotii Opera . . . . . Basil. 1732
Gussetii Comment. Linguæ Ebraicæ . . . . . Amstel. 1702

Hales's Methodism Inspected . . . . Dublin, 1803 and 1805
Halhed's Code of Gentoo Laws . . . . . Lond. 1776
Hallet's Notes and Discourses . . . . . Lond. 1729
Harris's Comment. on the 53d Ch. of Isaiah . . . . Lond. 1735
——— Hermes . . . . . Dublin, 1773
Haynes's (Hopton) Scripture Account, &c., ed. 4 . . Hackney, 1815
Heath's Essay towards a Version of Job . . . . Lond. 1756
Heidegger, Historia Patriarcharum Sacra . . . . Amstel. 1667
Heliodori Æthiopica . . . . . Francof. 1631
Hey's Lectures in Divinity . . . . . Cambr. 1796
Hobbes's Leviathan . . . . . Lond. 1651
Hodge's Elihu . . . . . Dublin, 1757
Hodii de Versionibus Græcis, &c. . . . . Oxon. 1705
Holmes's Four Tracts . . . . . Oxon. 1788
Horsley's Hosea . . . . . Lond. 1804
Hottingeri Smegma Orientale . . . . . Heidelb. 1658

Howes's Critical Observations—(Number 1.) . . . . Lond. 1776
N.B. The remaining numbers of the 4 Volumes published at intervals through a period of about 14 years.
Huetii Demonstratio Evangelica . . . . . Francof. 1722
Hume's Dialogues concerning Natural Religion . . . . Lond. 1779
——— Essays and Treatises . . . . . Dublin, 1779
——— History of England . . . . . Montrose, 1796
Hyde, Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum . . . . Oxon. 1760

Jablonski, Pantheon Ægyptiacum . . . . . Francof. 1750
Jennings's Jewish Antiquities . . . . . Lond. 1766
Job, Book of, translated by Miss Smith . . . . . Bath, 1810
Jones (Jerem.) on the Canon of the N. T. . . . . Lond. 1726
Jornandes De Rebus Geticis—Cassiodori Opera . . . . Aurel. 1622
Jortin's Remarks on Eccles. History . . . . . Lond. 1773
——— Life of Erasmus . . . . . Lond. 1760
Josephus, Opera . . . . . ed. Hudson. Oxon. 1720
——— translated by L'Estrange . . . . . Lond. 1702
Ittigius de Hæresiarchis . . . . . Lipsiæ, 1690
Juliani Opera . . . . . Lipsiæ, 1696
Justini Martyris Apologiæ Duæ . . . . . Lond. 1722

Kennicott's Remarks on Select Passages . . . . . Oxf. 1737
——————— State of the Hebrew Text . . . . . Oxf. 1753
——— ——— Two Dissertations . . . . . Oxf. 1747
Kidder's Commentary on the Five Books of Moses . . Lond. 1694
Koecheri Analecta . . . . . Altenburg. 1766
Krebsii Observationes e Flavio Josepho . . . . . Lips. 1575

Laplace, Exposition du Système du Monde . . . . Paris, 1798
——————— Traité de Mécanique Céleste . . . . . Paris, 1798
Lardner's Works, by Kippis . . . . . Lond. 1788
Lavoisier's Elements of Chemistry . . . . . Edinb. 1793
Laurence (Dr.) on the Logos . . . . . Oxf. 1808
——————— Critical Reflections on the Unitarian Version of the N. T. Oxf. 1811
——————— Remarks upon the Systematic Classification of Griesbach Oxf. 1814
Law's Theory of Religion . . . . . Camb. 1774
Layman's Letters to Mr. Wilberforce . . . . . Lond. 1799
Le Clerc, Novum Testamentum . . . . . Francof. 1714
Leland's Christian Revelation . . . . . Lond. 1764
Less on the Authenticity of the N. T. by Kingdon . . . Lond. 1804
Leslie's Theological Works . . . . . Francof. 1721
Letters from a late Eminent Prelate . . . . . Lond. 1809
Lightfoot's Works . . . . . Lond. 1684
Lindsey's Apology . . . . . Dublin, 1775
——————— Sequel to Apology . . . . . Lond. 1776
Lloyd's Christian Theology . . . . . Lond. 1804
Loccenii Antiquitates Suevo Gothicæ . . . . . Holm. 1647

Locœnii Historia Rerum Suecicarum . . . . . Francof. 1676
Locke's Works . . . . . Lond. 1768
Loesneri Observ. ad N. T. e Philone Alexandrino . . Lipsiæ, 1777
London (Bishop of), Charge . . . . . Lond. 1815
Lowth, De Sacrâ Poesi Hebræorum . . . . . Oxon. 1753
——— Letter to Warburton . . . . . Lond. 1766
——— Translation of Isaiah . . . . . Perth, 1793

Maimonides De Cultu Divino . . . . . Parisiis, 1671
——————— Moreh Nevochim, à Buxtorfio . . . . Basil. 1629
——————— De Pœnitenti, à Clavering . . . . . Oxon. 1705
——————— De Sacrificiis, à De Veil . . . . . Lond. 1683
Mallet's Northern Antiquities . . . . . Lond. 1770
Maltby's Illustrations of the Christ. Religion . . . . Camb. 1803
Marsh's Course of Lectures, parts i. ii. iii. . Camb. 1809, 1810. 1813
Marshami Canon Chronicus . . . . . Franeq. 1696
Martinii Sinica Historia . . . . . Amstel. 1659
Mason's Works of Gray . . . . . Lond. 1807
Maurice's Indian Antiquities . . . . . Lond. 1794
Mede's Works . . . . . Lond. 1672
Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke . . . . . Lond. 1752
Meuschen, Novum Testamentum, ex Talmude . . . Lips. 1736
Michaelis (J. D.), Grammatica Syriaca . . . . . Halæ, 1784
——— Introduction to the N. T. (by Marsh) . . . Camb. 1793
——— Notæ et Epimetra . . . . . Oxon. 1763
Mickle's (Camoëns) Lusiad . . . . . Dublin, 1791
Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek Article . . . Lond. 1808
Millii Novum Testamentum (ed. Kuster) . . . . Roterod. 1710
Mirabaud, Système de la Nature . . . . . Lond. 1781
Montucla, Histoire des Mathématiques . . . . Paris, 1758
More's (Hannah) Cœlebs . . . . . Lond. 1809
——————— Hints for a Young Princess . . . Lond. 1805
——————— Works . . . . . Dublin, 1803
Morgan's Moral Philosopher . . . . . Lond. 1737
Morini Exercitationes de Linguâ Primæva . . . Ultraject. 1694
Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History . . . . . Lond. 1765

Nares's Bampton Lecture Sermons . . . . . Oxf. 1795
——— Remarks on the Version of the N. T. by the Unitarians Lond. 1810
——————————— (2d ed.) . . . . Lond. 1814
Newcome's (Archbp.) Historical View of the English Biblical Translations . . . . . Dublin, 1792
Newton's Chronology . . . . . Lond. 1728
Nichols's Conference with a Theist . . . . . Lond. 1723
Noldii Concordantiæ Particularum Ebræarum . . . Jenæ. 1735
Nott's Bampton Lecture . . . . . Oxf. 1803

Orford's (Lord) Works . . . . . Lond. 1798
Origen against Celsus, by Bellamy . . . . . Lond.
Orme's History of Indostan . . . . . Lond. 1803

Outram De Sacrificiis . . . . . Amstel. 1688
Owen on the Hebrews, abridged by Williams . . . . Lond. 1790
Owen's Modes of Quotation . . . . . Lond. 1789

Palairet, Observationes Philologico-Criticæ . . . . Lugd. 1752
Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy . . . . . Dublin, 1793
Parr's Spital Sermon . . . . . Lond. 1804
Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, cura Ric. Russell . . Lond. 1746
Pauw Recherches Philosophiques sur les Americains . . Berl. 1768
Pearce's (Bishop) Commentaries and other Writings . Lond. 1777
Pearson on the Creed . . . . . Lond. 1715
——— Vindiciæ Epist. S. Ignat. . . . . Cantab. 1673
Pearson's Critical Essay on the Sixth Book of the Divine Legation
Camb. 1808
Peirce's Paraphrase . . . . . Lond. 1733
Percival's Father's Instructions, part iii. . . . . Lond. 1800
Peters's Critical Dissert. on Job . . . . . Lond. 1754
Pfochenii Diatribe de Lingua Græca N. T. . . . Amstel. 1633
Phavorini Lexicon . . . . . Basil. 1538
Philonis Opera . . . . . Parisiis, 1640
Photii Bibliotheca . . . . . Rothom. 1653
Pilkington's Remarks, &c. . . . . Camb. 1759
Platonis Opera . . . . . Francof. 1602
Plauti Opera (Lambini) . . . . . Paris. 1577
Plutarchi Opera . . . . . Francof. 1620
Pocock's Theological Works . . . . . Lond. 1740
Porphyrius de Abstinentiâ . . . . . Lugd. 1623
Powell's Discourses on various Subjects . . . . Lond. 1776
Pretyman's Elements of Christian Theology . . . Lond. 1800
Price's Four Dissertations . . . . . Lond. 1768
——— Review of Morals . . . . . Lond. 1769
Priestley's History of Corruptions, &c. . . . . Birming. 1782
——— Notes on Scripture . . . . . Northumb. 1802
——— Tracts in Controversy with Bishop Horsley (by Belsham)
Lond. 1815
Protestant Apology for the R. C. Church . . . . Dublin, 1809

Randolph's Sermons in Advent . . . . . Lond. 1801
Raphelii (G.) Annot. in Sacr. Script. . . . Lugd. Batav. 1747
Reid's Essays on the Intellect. Powers . . . . . Dublin, 1786
Remarks on Hume's Essay on the Nat. Hist. of Religion . Dublin, 1777
Rennell's Discourses on various Subjects . . . . Dublin, 1801
Richardson's Dissertation on the Language of Eastern Nations Oxf. 1770
Richie's Criticism on Modern Notions of Sacrifice . . Lond. 1761
——— Peculiar Doctrines of Revelation . . . Warringt. 1766
Rosenmüller (J. G.) Scholia in Nov. Test. . . Norimberg. 1792, &c.

Sale's Koran . . . . . Bath, 1795
Schnurrer, Dissert. Philolog. Criticæ . . . . . Gotheæ. 1790
Scholar Armed . . . . . Lond. 1795

Schultens, Liber Jobi . . . . . Lugd. Batav. 1737
——— Origines Hebrææ . . . . . Francof. 1724
Scripture Account of Sacrifices (by Portal) . . . . . Lond. 1755
Semleri Apparatus ad Liberalem N. T. Interpretationem. Halæ Magdeb. 1767
Senecæ Opera . . . . . Amstel. 1672
Shaw's Travels in Barbary and the Levant . . . . . Oxf. 1738
Sherlock's Use of Prophecy . . . . . Lond. 1749
Shuckford's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History . . Lond. 1743
Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque et des Prolegomènes de Dupin. Paris, 1790
——— Critical History of the O. T. . . . . Lond. 1682
Simpson's (Rev. David) Plea for the Deity of Jesus . . Lond. 1812
Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments . . . . . Lond. 1759
Socini Opera (Biblioth Fratr. Polon.) . . . . . Irenop. 1656
Socinianism Unmasked . . . . . Lond. 1815
Spanhemii Historia Jobi . . . . . Lugd. 1672
Spearman's Letters on the Septuagint . . . . . Edinb. 1759
Spencer, De Legibus Hebræorum . . . . . Cantab. 1727
——— Discourse on Prodigies . . . . . Lond. 1665
Stebbing's Examination of Warburton . . . . . Lond. 1747
Stewart's (Dugald) Elem. of the Philos. of the Human Mind Lond. 1792
Stillingfleet's Origines Sacræ . . . . . Lond. 1724
Sermons on several Occasions . . . . . Lond. 1673
Stock's Isaiah . . . . . Bath, 1803
——— Job . . . . . Bath, 1805
Strabo . . . . . Amstel. 1707
Stuart's View of Society in Europe . . . . . Lond. 1782
Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus . . . . . Amstel. 1682
Suidæ Historica . . . . . Basil. 1564
Sykes's Essay on Sacrifices . . . . . Lond. 1748
——— Essay on the Truth of the Christ. Relig. . . Lond. 1725
——— Scripture Doctrine of Redemption . . . . Lond. 1756

Taciti Opera, ed. Brotier . . . . . Paris. 1771
Theological Repository, vols. 1, 2, 3 . . . . . Lond. 1795
——— ——— vols. 4, 5, 6 . . . . Birm. 1784. 1786. 1788
Thesaurus Temporum cum Jos. Scalig. Animadv. . . Amstel. 1658
Tindal's Christianity as Old as the Creation . . . . Lond. 1732
Tillotson's Works . . . . . Lond. 1728
Townson's Discourses on the Gospels . . . . . Oxf. 1788
Tyrwhitt's Commentaries and Essays . . . . . Lond. 1782

[Unitarian] Version of the New Testament . . . Lond. 1808
Universal History (Ancient) . . . . . Dublin, 1745

Van Mildert's Boyle Lecture Sermons . . . . . Lond. 1806
Velthusen, &c., Comment. Theologicæ . . . . . Lips. 1794-1798
Venema, Opuscula Inedita . . . . . Leovardiæ, 1778
Veysie's Bampton Lecture . . . . . Oxf. 1795
——— Defence of the Preservative . . . . Exeter, 1810

Villier's Essay on the Reformation (Mills) . . . . . Lond. 1803
Vitringæ Comment. in Jesaiam . . . . . Leov. 1714
Volney's Ruins . . . . . Lond. 1795
Vorstius de Hebraismis N. T. . . . . Amstel. 1665
Vossius (Ger. J.) De Theologia Gentili et Idololatria . . Francof. 1668
——— ——— Disputatio Gemina . . . . . Amstel. 1648

Wakefield's Inquiry into the Opinions of the First Three Centuries . . . . . Lond. 1784
——— ——— ——— Translation of the New Test. . . . . Lond. 1795
Warburton's Divine Legation . . . . . Lond. 1738
——— ——— Principles of Natural and Rev. Relig. . . Lond. 1753
Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy . . Glasg. 1814
Walker's Letter to Belsham . . . . . Dublin, 1799
Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible . . . . . Dublin, 1807
Watson's (Bp. of Llandaff) Two Apologies, &c. . . . . Lond. 1806
Wesley's (John) Sunday Service of the Methodists . . Lond. 1790
Wesley (Samuel), Dissertationes in Librum Jobi . . Lond. 1736
Whitaker's Origin of Arianism . . . . . Lond. 1791
White's Commentary on Isaiah . . . . . Lond. 1709
Wilberforce's Practical View . . . . . Lond. 1797
Williams's Free Enquiry into the 1st and 2d Chapters of St. Matthew . . . . . Lond. 1789
Wilson's Illustration of the Method of explaining the New Testament . . . . . Camb. 1797
Winder's History of Knowledge . . . . . Lond. 1745
Windet, De Vita Functorum Statu. . . . . Lond. 1677
Witsii Egyptiaca . . . . . Herb. Nassav. 1717
——— Miscellanea Sacra . . . . . Herb. Nassav. 1712
Wolfii Curæ Philologicæ . . . . . Hamb. 1733
Wollaston's Religion of Nature . . . . . Lond. 1725

Young's Centaur not Fabulous . . . . . Dublin, 1755

G. Woodfall and Son, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

REC'D LD-URL
APR 15 1991

MAY 2 8 1991

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 038 278 8

rnia
l